

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 196 263

FL 011 873

AUTHOR Akita, George: And Others
TITLE Japanese Studies in the United States. A Report on the State of the Field, Present Resources and Future Needs.
INSTITUTION American Council of Learned Societies, New York, N.Y.; Social Science Research Council, New York, N.Y.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 387p.
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC16 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Area Studies; College Second Language Programs; Graduate Study; Higher Education; Interdisciplinary Approach; *Japanese; Needs Assessment; Scholarship; Social Science Research; Undergraduate Study
IDENTIFIERS *Japanese Studies

ABSTRACT

This report presents the results of a systematic survey of the field of Japanese studies in the United States conducted during a period of eighteen months prior to 1970. The objectives of the report were: (1) to provide a fuller understanding of the contours of the field; (2) to offer documentation on the identity of scholars at work in the field; and (3) to clarify the importance of Japanese studies for the United States. The report is based on two primary sources of data. The first source was a series of nine disciplinary survey conferences of Japanese specialists from American universities and related institutions; the second source was a series of questionnaires. The substance of the report covers the following topics: (1) the case for Japanese studies; (2) the development of Japanese studies in the United States from 1934 to 1969 and a future projection; and (3) the state of Japanese studies today with regard to persons, institutions, students, the problem of language training, research and publications, libraries, and communication with Japanese scholars. The concluding section presents conclusions and recommendations of the study. (AMH)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED196263

Social Science Research Council

American Council of Learned Societies

JAPANESE STUDIES IN THE UNITED STATES

A Report on the State of the Field, Present
Resources and Future Needs

Prepared by the SSRC-ACLS Joint Committee on Japanese Studies

Members of the Committee:

George Akita
John W. Hall, chairman
Marius B. Jansen
Solomon B. Levine
William H. McCullough
Edwin O. Reischauer
Robert J. Smith
David A. Titus, executive secretary
Robert E. Ward
Martin Weinstein, executive secretary
Bryce Wood, SSRC staff

With Contributions by:

John W. Bennett
Robert H. Brower
Albert M. Craig
George A. DeVos
Dan F. Henderson
Eleanor H. Jorden
William H. McCullough
John M. Maki

Robert M. Marsh
Samuel E. Martin
Roy A. Miller
James W. Morley
Edward Norbeck
John M. Rosenfield
Henry Rosovsky
Robert E. Ward

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Social Science
Research Council

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FL 011 873

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
GENERAL REPORT	
Preface	v
I. The Case for Japanese Studies	1
A Look to the Future	5
The Crisis of the 1970's in Japanese Studies	7
II. The Development of Japanese Studies in America	11
Two Profiles: 1934 and 1969	11
Stages of Development: 1934 to 1969	15
The Future of Japanese Studies: Beyond Area Studies	22
III. Japanese Studies Today: State of the Field, Problems, Needs	29
The Field as Persons	29
The Field as Institutions	32
Students: their Recruitment and Support	45
The Problem of Language Training	51
The Field as Research and Publications	60
The Library Problem	69
Communication with Japanese Scholars	74
IV. Conclusions and Summary of Recommendations	76
APPENDICES	
1. A Statistical Profile of Japan's World Status	83
2a. Institutional Distribution of Japanese Specialists	85
2b. Distribution of Japanese Specialists by Discipline	88
2c. American Universities and Colleges with Undergraduate Enrollments in Japanese Language Courses	89
2d. American Universities with Graduate Student Enrollments in Japanese Language Courses	92
2e. Enrollments in Japanese Language Courses Showing Comparisons with Other Languages	94
2f. Enrollments at the Inter-University Center for Japanese Studies in Tokyo	96
2g. Check List of U.S. Colleges and Universities Supporting Area Studies Relating to Japan as of 1962	97

	Page
2h. List of NDEA Language and Area Centers Which Offer Work in East Asian Studies	100
2i. Listing by Institutions of 1969-1970 Quotas for Graduate Fellowships (NDFL) in East Asian Studies	101
2j. Distribution by Awarding Institution and Discipline of Ph.D.'s in the Japanese Field	102
2k. American Universities with Library Holdings of Japanese Language Materials of More than 10,000 Volumes in 1968	104
2l. List of Colleges and Universities by Category of Program	105
3. Summary of Results of the Questionnaires Sent to Individuals in the Field of Japanese Studies	107
4a. Pre-Doctoral Fellowships Available for Japanese Studies	132
4b. Pre-Doctoral Fellowships Available for Field Research in Japanese Studies	135
4c. Foreign Area Fellows Who Studied in Japan	136
4d. Joint ACLS-SSRC Asian Program Awards in Japanese Studies	141
4e. Distribution of Grants Awarded by the Board of Foreign Scholarships (Fulbright and Fulbright-Hays Programs)	144
4f. Japanese Government Grants for Study in Japan, 1955-1969	148
5. The Funding of Japanese Studies in American Universities	149
6. A Projection of Manpower Requirements in Japanese Studies, 1969-1979	156
7a. Meeting of Political Scientists Specializing in the Japanese Field	158
7b. Summary of Proceedings of Conference of Scholars in Anthropology, Psychology, and Sociology	179
7c. Conference on the Status of Studies in Japanese Economics	212
7d. Conference on the Status of Studies in Modern Japanese History	222
7e. Survey Conference on Premodern Japanese History and Religion	236
7f. Conference on the Status of Studies in Japanese Literature	249
7g. Conference on the Status of Studies in Modern Japanese Art	273

	Page
7h. Conference on the Status of Studies in Japanese Language and Linguistics	281
7i. Conference on Japanese Language Training	289
7j. Outline of Contacts Between Japanese and American Lawyers	304
8a. Holdings of Japanese and Chinese Materials in American Libraries	306
8b. Fiscal Support of Far Eastern Collections in American Libraries	308
8c. James W. Morley, "Hobbledehoy"	309
8d. First Japan-U.S. Conference on Libraries and Information Science in Higher Education, "Final Communique"	318
9. Recommendations of the Binational Conference on Translation of Japanese Scholarly Thought	320
10a. Background on the Fourth United States-Japan Conference on Educational and Cultural Interchange	325
10b. Fourth United States-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange, "Final Communique"	329

SUPPLEMENT

Roster of Scholars of Japanese Studies in the United States	334
--	-----

GENERAL REPORT

PREFACE

This report is the result of a systematic survey of the field of Japanese studies in the United States conducted over the past eighteen months by the Social Science Research Council--American Council of Learned Societies' Joint Committee on Japanese Studies. The Committee itself has been funded by the Ford Foundation and was established in early 1968 partly for the purpose of devising and carrying out just such a survey.

The report has several objectives. First, for the body of scholars who specialize in Japanese studies, it is designed to provide a fuller understanding of the contours of the field, its membership, its major concerns, and its most acutely felt needs. Secondly, for those outside the field, it is meant to offer documentation on the identity of the scholars who are at work in the field, on their academic aspirations and achievements. And finally, toward possible sources of future financial support, it seeks to clarify the true importance of Japanese studies for the United States, the needs for support which the field currently faces, and the suggested priorities among these needs.

The report is based upon two primary sources of data. The first is a series of nine disciplinary survey conferences that brought together for the first time representative groups of Japanese specialists from American universities and related institutions in the fields of political science and law; anthropology, sociology and psychology; economics; modern history; early history and religion; literature; art and the

history of art; language and linguistics; and the teaching of the Japanese language. Each conference produced a report on the status and needs of its area of concern. These are reproduced in the appendices. The second primary source was a series of quite elaborate questionnaires sent during 1969 to students, faculty, and organizations working in the field of Japanese studies. Most of the aggregate figures which describe conditions in the field on a national scale derive from these surveys.

The report has also used a number of other sources and would like to acknowledge indebtedness to them. Richard D. Lambert, director of the ongoing Social Science Research Council Review of Area and Language Programs, has been helpful in supplying information and assistance. The Committee has also made extensive use of a report prepared by James W. Morley for the U.S. Office of Education in 1967 entitled "Japan in American Education," and of a still earlier report emerging from a conference on Japanese area studies held at the University of Michigan in May 1963 under the auspices of the United States-Japan Committee on Educational and Cultural Cooperation. The appendices also contain a number of special contributions in addition to those which stemmed from the survey conference. These include a report on the field of political science by John M. Maki; communications from George A. DeVos, Robert M. Marsh, and John W. Bennett; a paper on language training by Samuel F. Martin; and another on library problems by James W. Morley. The interpretation of these materials has, of course,

been our responsibility alone.

The Committee wishes to recognize several individuals for their assistance in preparing the report. William Bogaty of Yale tabulated the questionnaire replies and prepared the computer analysis. Elizabeth Massey of Yale prepared the Roster of Scholars and several of the statistical tables. Frank Shulman of the University of Michigan was most helpful in supplying information on Ph.D. recipients. Finally Bryce Wood of the Social Science Research Council was a constant source of assistance and guidance for the Committee and its work.

March 1970

John W. Hall

I

THE CASE FOR JAPANESE STUDIES

Japan does not force itself upon the attention of the American public with dramatic arguments. It does not entice us with the grandeur of ancient civilizations; it was not the mother of world religions; it does not pose overwhelming problems of population; it does not challenge us as an immediate threat. It could be pointed out that this is also true in large part of the other two major industrial complexes of the world--Western Europe, except for our cultural ties to its ancient civilizations, and the Soviet Union, except for its present threat potential. Actually the Japanese historical experience is comparable in length and significance to that of France, England, or Germany, and in its parallel feudal development--the only clear parallel to Western feudalism--is of particular comparative interest to those of us who share a feudal background. Among the great world religions, Buddhism and particularly its Zen form has been accessible to the West largely through Japan. And in modern times Japan's dramatic rise as a world power has had profound consequences for the United States. The case for Japanese studies rests in fact upon the firmest of premises: that Japan and the United States have common interests of the profoundest sort, that our relations with Japan in most fields will be as important and often as close as with any other nation in the world, and that because of language barriers and differences in cultural background, there is a greater need for conscious academic effort

to develop understanding and communication than with any other country in the world.

Japan's modernization since the middle of the nineteenth century has been a noteworthy story involving tragedy both for the Japanese and for us. Its surge forward in world standing in the past two decades has been even more remarkable. Japan now ranks third among the nations of the world in economic production. Its people have become major exporters of culture, science, technology, and scholarship. Its scientists and writers are known and respected in the West, just as its products are admired for their quality and inventiveness. Japan, in other words, has become a major part of that main stream of advanced international culture which was once monopolized by the West. Herman Kahn has gone so far as to predict that Japan may dominate the twenty-first century. Such a prediction seems close to incredible to the layman, yet it rests upon the economist's informed prediction of the growth of Japan's gross national product. Japan's GNP, which in 1970 should pass the \$200 billion mark, is expected to double by 1975 and should again double by 1980 if the current rate of increase is maintained. (See Appendix 1.) This means that in 1975 Japan by itself will be producing as much as the combined economies of the members of the European Common Market today. Trade relations between our countries--the United States is Japan's first trading partner while Japan stands second only to Canada as America's most important trading partner--can only grow more extensive, complex, and valuable.

The implications for Americans of Japan's newly acquired status are immense, as has been recognized by our national leaders. President Richard Nixon himself has put it most directly (Department of State, Bulletin, LXI, No. 1590, Dec. 15, 1969, p. 553). "As we look at the Pacific, the Pacific and Asia is the area of greatest promise and also the greatest peril. Whether Asia and the Pacific becomes an area of peace--as the 'Pacific' literally translated means--or an area of devastation for Asia and the world, will depend on what happens between the United States and Japan more than between any other peoples in the world. That is because we are the nations with the greatest wealth; we are the nations with potentially the greatest power." Our relationships with Japan are clearly far more complex and crucial than that with any other non-Western nation and, because of Japan's rapid growth, they will become proportionately more important as the years pass. In actual fact Japan has become more important to us in economic terms than Britain, France, or Germany and is likely to push to the fore in political, scientific and cultural terms as well. Yet Japan does not hold anything like the same position in the American consciousness as the more familiar countries of Europe. The popular image is still that of an exotic and precocious but easily dismissed newcomer.

An even more enduring case can be made for the unique value of Japanese studies in intellectual terms--as an effective way to broaden the focus of American education beyond its traditional narrow concentration on the Occident. Among the

countries of Asia, Japan is the one in which scholars can most directly and fruitfully communicate with their counterparts in the Western world. The development of the Japanese intellectual and academic community in the last century has opened up, as for no other Asian country, systematic knowledge about its history and present conditions. One has only to cite a few statistics to show the tremendous growth of the "knowledge industry" in Japan. There are today over 370 colleges and universities in Japan with a student population of over 1.4 million. Japan publishes annually over 40,000 titles in over half a billion copies, second only to the Soviet Union. Its scientists are responsible for an estimated one-sixth of all scientific publications in the world each year to keep themselves abreast of intellectual developments in the rest of the world.

The fact that Japan has become so integral and important a part of the modern world community means that "the Japanese experience" has become directly relevant to the modern experience at large. Japanese data are as significant for American social scientists as those derived from Europe. Japan is the one Asian country in which theoretical or comparative studies can be carried out with the greatest prospect of success. In many areas Japanese scholars have broken new ground which we can ill afford to ignore. Increasingly any science or art which neglects the Japanese dimension becomes partial and parochial.

At present the dialogue between the intellectual and

scholarly worlds of our two countries is remarkably active. But it is still only a fraction of what it should be and rests in unusually large degree on the effort of the Japanese to carry the discourse. For example, Japan translates nearly a thousand titles from English annually while we reciprocate with only 25 Japanese works in English translation. The American capability in the Japanese language is woefully inadequate. Our acquaintance with the work of Japanese scholars or the experience of Japanese men of affairs is for the most part filtered through inadequate conversion devices. There is no substitute for our own willingness to meet the Japanese half way in the effort to join our intellectual resources.

A Look to the Future

The economic, cultural, and scientific emergence of Japan thus poses a real challenge of understanding to the American people. The government needs more leaders capable of understanding the Japanese; so do private business and the mass media. The arts and sciences need more specialists who can convey the Japanese experience to American intellectual life. The schools and universities need more teachers who can integrate an understanding and appreciation of Japan into the general education of our students. Our academic disciplines must acquire more ways to feed Japanese data into their computations. Above all our people must learn to place Japan in a stable context of informed understanding--one not easily thrown off by political tensions.

Our national and scholarly interests obviously require

the establishment of mutual relationships between our countries of the scale, closeness, and intensity that have been developed over the years between the American people and those of Europe. Yet we face unusual difficulties in establishing an effective community of understanding. Japan is the only truly world power which does not have a "world language." Its culture has evolved in comparative isolation for over two thousand years. In many ways Japan remains the most culturally distinct and intellectually inaccessible of the great powers, and this fact impedes greatly the exchange of ideas and sentiments with the rest of the world. To this extent Japanese studies require special attention and a continuing special support of the kind which has been given to priority areas of national concern in the past.

Any solution to this national problem of infusing more knowledge about Japan into the American consciousness must, of course, involve many contributors: the press, business, various societies in the field of international relations, and government. The role of education, however, is crucial. The challenge of Japan within our educational system demands both more of what is already understood by the term "Japanese studies" and a variety of other activities which will increase the flow of intellectual exchange between our countries. In broad categories it calls for active recruitment of persons into the field, an increased professionalization of teaching and research on Japan, and a general improvement of the means of communication between the Japanese and American scholarly

worlds. To these ends the professional body of Japanese specialists in America, by virtue of its ability to bridge the language and cultural gaps and to facilitate the exchange of information and the enhancement of mutual understanding, constitutes a national resource many times more important than its present size would indicate.

The Crisis of the 1970's in Japanese Studies

For the last several years there has been brewing in Japan a situation rather colorfully heralded by the press as "The Crisis of 1970." This prospective crisis derives from the conjuncture of two sets of circumstances of basic importance to Japan's foreign relations. Both involve the United States. The first is the continuing negotiations surrounding the return of administrative control over Okinawa to Japan and the terms on which this will ultimately take place. The second is the fact that in June 1970 it becomes possible for either country to renounce or suggest the amendment of the 1960 United States-Japan Treaty of Mutual Cooperation and Security. By a curious coincidence 1970 has also become a year of potential crisis for the field of Japanese studies. As in Japan, it is due to an unfortunate conjuncture of events that in this instance are largely financial rather than political in nature.

Area and language programs in the United States--including Japanese studies programs--depend today upon three major sources of support: universities (and thus where public institutions are involved, on state or other local governments), the Ford Foundation (although a few other major foun-

dations are tangentially involved), and the federal government. The elements of the present crisis are clear. Universities, both public and private, that normally support from eighty to ninety per cent of the costs of operation of the programs in Japanese studies are faced with financial stringencies unparalleled for many years. Under these circumstances it is apt to be the newer and less well-established parts of the academic community that suffer first and most heavily from the inevitable budgetary cuts. Area programs are uniformly and conspicuously vulnerable on this score, not only because of their junior status as compared with the traditional schools and departments but also because of their extremely high cost. Moreover it can be plausibly argued that the interests served by their training and research programs are peculiarly national in nature.

The second major source of support for Japanese area and language programs has been the major foundations, today largely the Ford Foundation although both the Carnegie Corporation of New York and the Rockefeller Foundation have played important roles in the past. While the prospects are not yet completely clear, there seems to be a high probability of a general withdrawal of foundation support from our programs in the course of the next two to three years. The Ford Foundation has already announced to most, if not all, major centers of Japanese studies its intention to cease awarding the institutional grants upon which these centers are heavily dependent with the expiration of the present cycle of grants in 1973-74.

No alternative sources of foundation support on a significant scale are available.

The financial crisis that afflicts both state and private universities is, of course, duplicated at the level of the federal government. Hard decisions are being made as to how and where to cut the national budget. So far as Japanese studies programs are concerned, by long odds the most important source of federal financing is the National Defense Education Act of 1958 and, in particular, Title VI thereof which provides for the support of most of the graduate fellowships and an important part of the costs of operating and staffing most of the centers and many of the research programs in this field. The International Education Act which might have appreciably broadened this base of federal support has never been funded. At this writing the announced intention of the Administration is to cut the Title VI appropriation for fiscal 1971 by sixty per cent and to phase out these programs completely in fiscal 1972.

These then are the elements of the "crisis of 1970" in the field of Japanese studies: the tragic coincidence of a marked diminution in the fiscal capacity of state and private universities to fund such programs with the apparent intent of the Ford Foundation and the federal government to withdraw the bulk of their support within the next two to three years. The crisis is further compounded by the current turn of national interest toward domestic concerns and away from international studies in general. Yet if our views of the present and pro-

spective importance of Japan to the people of America are even approximately correct, it should be clear that this country has a profound, long term, and very special stake in the maintenance of the teaching, training, and research programs that are fundamental to our capacity for understanding and communicating with the Japanese. There are few other scholarly fields where such an argument can be made with the same degree of force and validity.

Against this background of the imminence and extent of the crisis confronting the field of Japanese studies in our country we turn to an analysis of the state of the field and the history of its development to its present condition.

II

THE DEVELOPMENT OF JAPANESE STUDIES IN AMERICA

Two Profiles: 1934 and 1969

In 1935 the American Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations published a fifty page booklet entitled Japanese Studies in the Universities and Colleges of the United States. The result of a survey conducted in 1934 by Professor Yasaka Takaki of Tokyo Imperial University, the booklet describes in some detail the state of Japanese studies thirty-five years ago as it was just beginning in the United States. The 1934 base point is most revealing. Professor Takaki lists 101 persons in universities, colleges, research institutes, museums, and international relations groups who were engaged in or "interested in" Japanese studies. Obviously the list was grossly inflated. Only about sixty of those named were actually involved in college or university instruction, and many of these only peripherally. Represented were twenty-five institutions of higher education, of which Harvard with ten faculty members, Columbia with seven, and the University of Michigan with five showed the largest concentration of personnel with Japanese interests. Another five institutions were listed as having three or more faculty who taught Japanese subjects. These were the University of California at Berkeley, Chicago, Stanford, Washington, and Yale.

More significant than numbers was the quality of instruction and the credentials of those offering work on Japan in 1934. Eight institutions (Harvard, Yale, Columbia, Berke-

ley, Washington, Stanford, Hawaii, and Northwestern) are described as offering some training in the Japanese language. This was uniformly the work of native instructors and, almost without exception, the responsibility of one man per institution. There were no proper teaching materials. Training was available only to advanced graduate students and only after they had persuasively demonstrated their need for it. Instruction in Japanese studies other than language was largely conducted by non-professionals: returned missionaries, specialists in international relations or men trained in other fields who had developed a Japanese interest late in their academic careers. Most were generalists who taught about both China and Japan. Few read or spoke Japanese. Among the 101 persons on the extended list eight were native Japanese and these comprised almost the entire corps of language training personnel in the United States. There were only thirteen Americans sufficiently trained in the language to be able to use Japanese materials in their research. Of these, five were still students: the Reischauer brothers, Hugh Borton, Gordon Bowles and Burton Fahs. They constituted the first generation of academically trained Japanese specialists the United States was to produce. Significantly, Robert Reischauer was studying at the time in Japan; Edwin Reischauer and Fahs were to do their advanced training in France and Japan; Borton, in Leiden and Japan; and Bowles, primarily in Japan. Such was the state of Japanese studies in 1934: a field dominated by part-time practitioners and amateurs who offered only the bare begin-

nings of serious professional training at the college and university level.

Thirty-five years later the field of Japanese studies in the United States has been dramatically transformed. The survey conducted by the Joint Committee on Japanese Studies (Appendix 3) reveals that there are approximately five hundred faculty and advanced graduate students working in American institutions of higher learning as of 1969. Of those active in the field eighty-eight per cent possess Ph.D.s and another six per cent are at work on their doctorates. These persons are located at some 135 colleges and universities. (See Appendix 2a.) Of these institutions, sixty-one employed two or more Japanese specialists on their faculties and twenty-seven had four or more. Figures for 1968 show that across the country seventy-five institutions reported enrollments in undergraduate courses in the Japanese language, although only about twenty offered graduate instruction. (See Appendices 2c, 2d.) The vast majority of academic specialists (ninety-five per cent) now read and speak Japanese, having received language training in the United States and in Japan. Twenty-five per cent of those who are not native speakers have studied in Japan for more than two years, and fifty per cent have had more than three years of language study in the United States. Thus the norm has become well established that the academic specialist on Japan today must have adequate language training to make his way through the necessary Japanese materials and among Japanese scholars in his field, that he must have broad

"area" training as well as professional skills in a particular discipline, and that he must have completed a doctoral dissertation in a recognized discipline based on original Japanese materials or data and not simply a review of Japanese secondary works. Significantly, most of the specialist's training can now be acquired in the United States, necessitating study in Japan only for advanced language work and for field or documentary research.

As might be expected this condition has led to a marked improvement in the quality of both new Ph.D.s trained in Japanese studies and of research published by scholars in the field. The 350 or so Ph.D.s produced in the Japanese field since 1947 approximates the number of 416 individuals listed in the roster of active scholars of Japan prepared by the Joint Committee. (See Supplement.) Since 1947, in other words, those who have been added to the field have been almost entirely the products of professional graduate preparation and effective field training and research.

In terms of research the changes have been even more dramatic. Until the mid 1950's the standard bibliographies of the field covering all disciplines referred almost exclusively to works published before 1945. Reading lists and syllabi of the late 1960's now rarely refer to these prewar works. A guide to the field compiled in 1967 and listing just over 100 standard works showed the following distribution of publication dates:*

*Hyman Kublin, What Shall I Read on Japan (New York, 1967).

through 1955	6
1956-1959	12
1960	7
1961	5
1962	10
1963	19
1964	12
1965	18
1966	10
1967	

Some fields, notably modern history and political science, have been totally renewed as recently as 1965. A combination of second-round publications by the war-trained generation of Japanese specialists and the first round of publications from students trained by this earlier generation have by and large superseded all previous works in these fields. Professional scholarship in at least some Japanese fields is now two generations and very shortly will be three generations deep.

Stages of Development: 1934 to 1969

In reaching its present state the field of Japanese studies has passed through several distinct stages of development since 1934. In the years prior to the outbreak of war in the Pacific the institutional base for Japanese studies remained much as Professor Takaki had described it. It was upon this base that the first modest but significant increments of support for training and research were made by the Rockefeller Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation, the Institute of Pacific Relations, the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council. Yet as of 1941 academic experts on Japan could still be "counted on two hands." Japan

remained a land of mystery to even the educated American.

The war years and the subsequent period of military occupation were to change the entire basis of the relationship between the United States and Japan. During the war a number of Americans were given intensive training in Japanese language and area programs; many were later sent to Japan for occupation duty. The classroom training and service experience of these men, while not particularly academic, was intensive. Some sixteen per cent of the current body of Japanese academic specialists acquired their initial commitment to the field during World War II. If we include those involved in the Korean War, a total of thirty-five per cent gained their interest and some of their competence in Japanese studies through military or occupation-related training and service. Among those between the ages of forty-one and fifty, an astonishing forty-nine per cent were directly influenced by the war. The war years thus provided an unusual stimulus to the field of Japanese studies. They also produced an unusually large number of linguistically competent scholars.

The next step in the development of Japanese studies was taken with the influx of this wartime group of partially trained and highly committed students into our colleges and universities. This was supplemented by the new support given to "area studies" by certain of the large foundations and ultimately by the Federal Government as well. Developments after 1946 are relatively well known. They began with the creation of the Committee on World Area Research by the Social

Science Research Council in 1946 and the first grants in support of area centers made by the Carnegie Corporation of New York in 1947. By 1950 there were six major area programs dealing in whole or in part with Japan: the Far Eastern Studies Program at Yale (1945), the Far Eastern and Russian Institute at the University of Washington (1946), the Center for Japanese Studies at Michigan (1947), The East Asia Regional Studies Program at Harvard (1947), the East Asian Institute at Columbia (1948), and the Institute of East Asiatic Studies at Berkeley (1949).

The initiation of the Fulbright agreement with Japan in 1951, the passage of the National Defense Education Act in 1958, and the start of active Ford Foundation interest in foreign area research at about the same time mark the period of the 1950's and 1960's, particularly after 1958, as a most important stage in the growth of Japanese studies. From the Ford Foundation and the Federal Government, with added support from the Carnegie Corporation and the Rockefeller Foundation, came a flow of new funds for staff, libraries, student fellowships, and field research. The total input from sources outside the normal university and college financial structure in the last twelve years is hard to determine exactly. The rough estimate worked out by the authors of this report (Appendix 5) is on the order of \$19 million, of which the federal government through the Department of Health, Education and Welfare plus the Fulbright program provided somewhat over half. The amount is slightly more than half of the estimate for Chinese.

studies.* Its significance is enhanced when we consider how large a percentage it represents of total national support for the field of Japanese studies, especially for its growth since 1958. The amount can only be estimated, of course, but--based on the assumption that the field has a current annual worth of about \$15 million for salaries, training support, and services--these external contributions by the foundations and government probably comprise on the order of ten to fifteen per cent of the total cost of expansion in the field since 1958. In the process, however, they have provided well over 60 per cent of the pre-doctoral and post-doctoral training and research funds over the same period and nearly all of the support for conferences, organizational meetings, field surveys, and the like. They have without a doubt constituted the cutting edge of the factors that have brought about the remarkable growth and improvement in quality of the field over the last twelve years.

Given the almost total absence of a professional field of Japanese studies in the United States in 1934 or even in 1945, the previous statistics of growth are impressive. There have been notable advances in quantity and in quality at all levels of training and research. But two basic facts should be borne in mind. First, if one starts with a base of only thirteen adequately trained American specialists in 1934,

*See the estimate contained in the ACLS-SSRC Joint Committee on Contemporary China report on the conference on "The Status of Studies of Modern and Contemporary China" (New York, March 15-16, 1968).

given the intervention of the war and its effects upon our national relationship with Japan, both percentile and absolute statements of increases in qualified personnel by 1970 are bound to be misleading. Twenty-six adequately trained specialists would represent an improvement factor of one hundred per cent. The more remarkable fact, therefore, is the poverty of our national resources in Japanese studies in 1934. Measured against any conceivable standard of national needs, the field is still woefully small and weak.

Ideally, of course, since Japan represents the fourth largest industrial complex in the world (after the United States, Western Europe, and the Soviet Union), Japanese studies should hold a position commensurate with its international rank, at least in our system of higher education. One could even argue that, as the only one of these four regions with a non-Occidental cultural background and therefore as the one with the most divergent and perhaps instructive patterns of modern institutions and value systems, it deserves disproportionately larger attention. And this argument could be strengthened by the fact that elementary and secondary education in the United States remains almost completely culture-bound to the Occident and is not likely to overcome this pre-modern bias until higher education itself has succeeded in encompassing the non-Western world much better than it has to date.

Ideally then, one could say that Japanese studies should at least equal the level of Soviet studies in this

country. Yet as the figures in Appendix 2e show, students of the Japanese language number less than one-tenth of those who study Russian in college, and as for French, the ratio is one hundred to one. The same is true for the academic faculty. Our survey has shown that there are at present roughly 500 Japanese specialists at work in 135 or so of our colleges and universities. The number of specialists would have to be increased ten fold to over five thousand if Japanese subject matter were to be adequately introduced into the curricula of all of the over fifteen hundred colleges and universities in the country. A further doubling of personnel would be necessary to reach the junior colleges of the nation, and repeated doublings to reach down into the high schools and junior high schools. While the logic of such arguments may be compelling in the abstract, unfortunately their practical consequences have been small. In terms of numbers at least our Japanese curricula and staff are not even remotely comparable to those in the fields of Western European or Soviet studies.

The ostensibly impressive record of growth from 1934 to 1970 also obscures another fact of basic importance. The advances since 1945 have by no means been spontaneous. The present state of Japanese studies is primarily due to two external factors: the stimulus of the war and occupation years and the infusion of financial support after 1958 from the Ford Foundation and the Federal Government. We are well aware that the first stimulus was a byproduct of a major national crisis, but we sometimes forget that the spurt of activity after 1958

was also the result of a crisis--the shock created by the successful launching of Sputnik. Thus the field of Japanese studies has yet to establish itself under a fully thought out long-range philosophy of support. The field remains heavily dependent upon external sources of support which were generated under crisis conditions.

Japanese studies thus face certain acute problems of growth, if not of survival, in the decade ahead. First, there is the problem we have just discussed, that of impact and effectiveness. So long as less than one per cent of American college youth receives even the most superficial exposure to knowledge about Japan, it is difficult to assume that even the most minimal national needs are being met. So long as recruitment into the field requires special inducements it cannot be assumed that the field has established itself in the main stream of our academic effort. Second, there is the problem of balance and resiliency within the field. Certain disciplines are seriously underdeveloped; others are barely turning out enough new scholars to assure survival. The growth of the last twelve years is by no means firmly rooted. The third problem is closely related to the second and concerns the question of academic legitimacy. However much the practitioners of Japanese studies may believe that they have as much of value to say as their colleagues who generalize upon data derived from our own or European society and however justified this belief may be, the fact is that they are not so accepted in academic circles. Questions of form as well as

substance are deeply involved, in particular the distinction between so-called "area" and "disciplinary" approaches. As long as Japanese subject matter remains encapsulated in an "area studies" shell, its professional status will be compromised. As long as the Japanese language and culture are generally regarded as "exotic," the forces of Eurocentrism will prevail and there will be little recognition of the immense potential importance of Japanese experience and Japanese scholarship for us in America.

The Future of Japanese Studies: Beyond Area Studies

Earlier in this report the apprehension was expressed that Japanese studies face a crisis in the decade of the 1970's. This stemmed from the realization that two trends of basic importance to the field are diverging with consequences that are extremely dangerous. One is the dramatic upward swing of Japan's importance to the world and to the United States in economic, political, scientific and cultural terms. The other is the apparent downward trend of American interest in international studies and in the willingness of foundations and the government to support them. Our review of the history and present state of Japanese studies has now added a third element to this crisis, namely the search for academic legitimacy and status on the part of Japanese studies. This is in large part a problem internal to the field itself. Japanese studies, if it is to enter a phase of sustained and self-generating growth, must find a way to move beyond the confines of area studies. It must find a way to close the gap between

area and discipline in both intellectual and pedagogical terms.

Despite its marked advances since the 1940's Japanese studies in this country are still heavily reliant upon the area studies method of organization and support. The Joint Committee's questionnaire reveals how important area studies programs remain as a way of mobilizing academic personnel and resources and of satisfying the training and research needs of the field. The reasons are obvious. The field lacks status as a regular academic department yet requires library resources, student fellowships, faculty research funds, and secretarial and other services which are departmental in scale. The area program or center thus becomes the organizational alternative. It becomes an essential means of acquiring special but necessary professional facilities that individual Japanese specialists working alone in their departments would usually be unable to acquire through regular departmental channels. In the near future at least the further expansion of Japanese studies will have to be accomplished through the device of area programs and centers. Despite the increased willingness of colleges and universities to add individual Japanese specialists to their faculties, only separately organized and externally funded area centers or programs can provide an environment hospitable to the training and maintenance of effective Japanese specialists. Yet this reliance on an area-based pattern of organizational support perpetuates the "special program" nature of Japanese studies. Academic legitimacy is thus still denied.

This need for continued support for Japanese studies as an area-based field in terms of centers and programs must somehow be accommodated with the search for academic legitimacy. Given a bit more time, this accommodation may not prove as difficult to achieve as has usually been imagined. In fact, the Japanese experience would argue that, although little recognized, the process is already well under way. Consider the following aspects of current practice in the field of Japanese studies.

First, the scope of the problem tends to be exaggerated in the sense that people forget that it really exists only for the social science components of area studies. No such denial of legitimacy afflicts Japanese specialists in disciplines such as language, literature, religion, fine arts, or history. Organization and specialization by areas is customary in such cases. The same is true for somewhat different reasons for anthropologists with an area specialization. The problem does exist, however, for economists, sociologists, political scientists, psychologists, and--again for different reasons--philosophers interested in non-Western thought systems. This is the group that has in varying degrees felt isolated or alienated from the main stream of theoretical changes in their disciplines or, at least, has been so regarded by many of their colleagues. It should not be forgotten, however, that this group represents only a minority of specialists in the field of Japanese studies.

Second, the pattern of training Japanese specialists

that has gradually emerged and secured general acceptance over the years since 1945 is quite different from the more area-fixated conceptions that were rather widely discussed in the 1950's. The uniform practice at present is to encourage graduate students at the beginning of their career to acquire a solid command of the Japanese language, if they have not already done this as undergraduates, and extensive training in the area. From the outset, however, the individual's program is built about a core of disciplinary specialization and, after completing his master's degree or area certificate, he is expected to fulfill all normal requirements for the doctorate in his discipline of specialization. The current product is a professional in economics, sociology, or political science who, by dint of an investment of additional time in graduate school of the order of two years, adds to this the equipment and skills of an area specialist on Japan. In this way the training gap that once separated doctoral degrees with area specialization from those with disciplinary specialization has practically ceased to exist in the social sciences--except for the additional training time required for the former. A comparable gap has, of course, never existed in the humanities.

Third, the above shift in patterns of graduate training has in the Japanese case taken place within the context of a larger evolutionary development within the field that is of major importance. Looking back over the brief postwar history of Japanese and other area studies in this country, it seems to us that in their earlier stages of development all of these

programs have been characterized by a quality that might be described as a sort of scholarly nationalism. We tended to focus more on our area than on our disciplinary identifications, to be more cult-like in our absorption with the mystique of a non-Western language and culture, and to cluster more in area-oriented groups that constituted a form of defensive alliance against the perceived suspicion and rivalry on the part of the traditional departments. While in the case of the Japanese group the present degrees of departure from this stereotype differ appreciably with the age, eminence, and style of particular university centers or programs, they have in all cases been impressive. Together with Russian studies, Japanese studies are in general the oldest of the postwar area programs. We suspect that most would agree that they are probably also the most sophisticated and advanced in a scholarly sense. The direction and ultimate goal of the evolutionary process they have undergone is quite clear, especially where their social science component is concerned. It is toward an intellectual, methodological, and theoretical rapprochement with the disciplines. Even for the area specialists the Japanese experience has become much more a datum for development and exploitation in comparative and theoretical terms than an object of study in and for its own sake.

One factor that has increasingly contributed to the certainty and universality of this outcome so far as the social sciences are concerned has been the marked change in the last ten years in the disciplinary training given graduate

students. At all major universities, although in differing degree, this has become increasingly behavioral, methodological, and theoretical in character. The consequences from the area standpoint has been a process of convergence of disciplinary training for area and disciplinary candidates that has substantially altered the patterns of professional interest and approach on the part of the younger generation of Japanese specialists. This is apparent in their teaching, research and writing. For the Japanese field at least, this marks a point in time at which the old split between area and disciplinary approaches has begun to lose what significance it had and when the search for academic legitimacy on the part of Japanese specialists has begun to meet with a significant degree of success. We expect over time that the same will be true of other area fields as well.

The remaining problem which confronts the American specialist in Japan is in large part that of the assimilation of Japanese substance into the general disciplinary fields. Natural scientists long ago devised a universal language to link such fields as mathematics, physics, biology, and medicine into worlds that knew no national divisions or speech barriers. The social scientists and humanists have been much slower to attempt this. Indeed they have only recently begun to bridge the profound gaps in intellectual tradition and vocabulary that separate Europe and Asia. The important fact about our present relationship with Japan is that scholars on both sides of the Pacific are beginning to talk the same language in

these less exact fields of study. But the dialogue has only begun, and it cannot be continued without an apparatus that will encourage and support it.

The future of Japanese studies thus leads beyond the area approach in the conventional sense. The responsibility for moving it in this direction lies both with the members of the field themselves and with the wider academic community and its patrons. For the practitioners of Japanese studies the need is for more theoretically- and comparatively-oriented studies as a means of assimilating their knowledge into the main stream of academic concern. For those outside the field the problem is one of recognizing Japan's potential contributions to world well-being and scholarship. Behind both these efforts must stand a far more widespread recognition of Japan's international stature as the equivalent of that of Europe.

III

JAPANESE STUDIES TODAY: STATE OF THE
FIELD, PROBLEMS, NEEDSThe Field as Persons

The Joint Committee's survey has given us the most accurate profile available of the 500 or so persons who make up the field of Japanese studies, their distribution by discipline and institution, their state of mind with respect to their specialty, and their concerns and needs for the future. Only highlights of the survey--which are reproduced in Appendix 3--will be sketched here. Some of the results have already been described in earlier chapters.

Two points need clarification at the start. First, the figure of 500 individuals which we use for the total number of Japanese specialists is an estimate. It is a figure somewhat higher than the number of names on our roster of specialists which is confined to established scholars and advanced graduate students actually holding teaching appointments. (See Supplement.) But it is less than the 717 members of the Association for Asian Studies who list Japan as at least one of their areas of interest. Omitted from the roster are a number of categories which might be considered part of a broader definition of the field: government employees, American faculty in Canadian or Japanese universities, temporary instructors in language, journalists, and those who have left active research and teaching in the field of administrative or other professional careers. We have, however, taken a working figure

somewhat larger than the number in our roster because we are aware that our criteria for inclusion in the roster have been relatively narrow and furthermore than we have had considerable difficulty in obtaining accurate data especially for the new members of the field. The second observation is that our analysis of the field must generally be expressed in terms of percentages, since information on many points has had to be extrapolated from the 332 replies received. More specific numerical totals for the entire field have not been obtainable.

Our survey shows, first, that the field is youthful--forty-nine per cent of its membership is under forty-one years of age; and eighty-one per cent is under fifty-one. Distribution by discipline shows a high concentration in the humanities (sixty-five per cent) and obvious weaknesses in most of the social sciences. This is apparent from the disciplinary breakdown of the 416 persons listed in the roster:

History	110	Sociology	15
Language-Linguistics	98	Philosophy-Religion	15
Political Science	52	Geography	8
Literature	33	Education	5
Anthropology	28	Psychology	4
Economics	22	Other	9
Art-Architecture	16		

This unevenness in disciplinary distribution conforms in general fashion to a similar tendency in American higher education as a whole. A heavy preponderance in history-language-literature and relative weakness in the social sciences and art is not, therefore, an unexpected finding. But the profile for Japanese studies does display certain unusual

features. History with over one-quarter of the field's membership is far out of proportion to economics, for instance, while anthropology bulks much larger than sociology. But the most significant finding is the small number of specialists in fields other than history, language and literature, anthropology, and political science. Their numbers are very small indeed, so that the present capacity of the field to provide training in the less popular disciplines is extremely limited. Given the fact that the 500 members of all fields are located at some 135 institutions and that their disciplinary distribution is of the sort described, it is apparent that there are presently not quite enough historians even to staff each of these institutions. Political scientists are in sufficient supply to staff only about a third of the institutions. Sociologists and economists could be found for only a tenth of the total. In other words the national supply of Japanese specialists is very shallow in almost all fields but history and language.

The skewed pattern of distribution of the members of the Japanese field is reflected in the distribution of supporting facilities for the field. Research funds, library facilities, stimulus and professional appreciation from colleagues are high among the factors making for a sense of academic well-being for any faculty member. That the Japanese scholar working outside of the major centers or concentrations of Japanese specialists is apt to find these factors lacking to a distressing degree is quite clearly reflected in the re-

sponses to the questionnaires. In terms of library facilities, for instance, almost fifty per cent of the respondents were obliged to solve their research needs on the basis of personal collections and materials sent them privately from Japan. Twenty-five per cent were forced to rely primarily on libraries at institutions other than their own, and fifteen per cent were largely dependent on inter-library loans. A large proportion of the scholars who were obliged to work in such professional isolation found much with which to be dissatisfied.

The Field as Institutions

At this writing a larger scale survey of academic institutions engaged in Japanese studies is being conducted through the cooperative efforts of the Joint Committee on Japanese Studies and an SSRC-HEW sponsored general review of area studies in the United States. When that survey is complete our information on the institutional setting and structure of Japanese studies programs will be greatly enriched. But the more prominent features of "the field as institutions" are well enough known to justify the following preliminary comments.

Institutional questionnaires were sent to 190 institutions. This is larger than the actual number of institutions employing recognized Japanese specialists (as listed in Appendix 2a) because of the fact that coursework involving Japan is in some instances taught by men who are not specialists by our terms of reference (most often their real specialization is in

Chinese studies). The basic roster of specialists that we have compiled yields some 135 institutional employees. Of the 135, sixty-one institutions employed two or more specialists, twenty-seven employed four or more, and eleven, eight or more. There were seventy-five institutions teaching Japanese at the undergraduate level in 1968 (see Appendix 2c). Of these, the twenty-three which appear in Appendix 2d also offered graduate language training. There are in the country some thirty-eight libraries with individual holdings of more than five hundred volumes in Japanese. Of these, twenty-one had holdings of 10,000 or more (see Appendix 2k). Finally, the roster of National Defense Education Act Language and Area Centers in Asian and East Asian Studies (all of which offer some specialized work on Japan) includes some twenty-five programs. These are listed in Appendix 2h.

This information makes it possible to sketch a rough institutional profile of the field. First, it is apparent that only sixty institutions are sufficiently engaged in Japanese studies to offer some measure of undergraduate concentration in the area plus some language training. In alphabetical order these are:

University of Arizona
 Arizona State University
 Brigham Young University
 University of California, Berkeley
 University of California, Los Angeles
 University of California, Santa Barbara
 California State College, Hayward
 University of Chicago
 Claremont Colleges
 University of Colorado
 Columbia University

Cornell University
 Earlham College
 University of Florida
 Georgetown University
 Harvard University
 University of Hawaii
 Humboldt State College
 University of Illinois
 Indiana University
 University of Iowa
 Iowa State College
 University of Kansas
 University of Kentucky
 Manhattanville College
 University of Maryland
 University of Massachusetts
 Miami University (Ohio)
 University of Michigan
 Michigan State University
 University of Minnesota
 University of New Mexico
 New York University
 State University of New York, Buffalo
 State University of New York, New Paltz
 University of North Carolina
 Northwestern University
 Ohio State University
 University of Oregon
 University of Pennsylvania
 University of Pittsburgh
 Princeton University
 University of Rochester
 San Diego State College
 San Francisco State College
 San Jose State College
 Seton Hall University
 University of Southern California
 Stanford University
 Syracuse University
 University of Texas
 Union University
 Vanderbilt University
 Washington University
 University of Washington
 Wesleyan University
 University of Wisconsin
 Wisconsin State University
 Yale University

Of these institutions, less than half are regularly engaged in producing Ph.D.s with Japanese specialization, and it

is in these that the country's major concentrations of Japanese specialists are to be found. The total list of institutions in which Japanese specialists are working thus demonstrates a considerable range of staff and program facilities. For purposes of analysis, therefore, it is useful to envisage three general types of programs categorized by the size and diversity of staff and offerings.

1. The Minimal Undergraduate Program

Of the 135 institutions in which Japan specialists are working, seventy-four fall into the category of those which offer at most one or two survey courses relating to Japan. There may be considerable general interest in non-Western studies, but specialization on Japan is limited to one member of the faculty. Japanese language is not taught and is available if at all only through some cooperative program. There are no library holdings in Japanese. There is no way for a student to concentrate in Japanese studies even as an informal, inter-departmental minor.

2. The Undergraduate Area Program

Sixty-one colleges and universities, at the level of their undergraduate programs, have at least two Japanese specialists and offer at least elementary training in the Japanese language. Those in this category which are limited to undergraduate training have at least two departments strongly committed to the Japanese field. Course offerings include at least six semester courses relating exclusively or substantially to Japan. Most of these institutions possess a minimum

collection of works in Japanese.

Possibly the most extensive undergraduate program in Japanese studies for the size of the student body is that at Earlham College, Indiana. In answer to the Committee's questionnaire, the college reports that in 1968-69 there were 115 enrollments in courses related exclusively to Japan and 822 enrollments in courses devoted substantially (one-third or more class time) to Japan, despite the fact that the total student body numbered only 1048. Although Earlham offered no formal Japan studies major, forty-five undergraduates were specializing in the Japan field within a disciplinary major. Cooperation with nearby institutions created a relatively broad base for Japanese studies including language training. The college also had approximately 500 volumes in Japanese.

In the case of Earlham College external starter funds followed by continued, if diminished, external support have been of critical importance. When the program first started in 1959, seventy-five per cent of its cost was met through a grant from the Ford Foundation. In 1962-63, the program was financed exclusively from external sources: seventy-five per cent from the Ford Foundation and the rest from the federal government. By 1968-69, however, external support had decreased to the twenty-five per cent which came from the government, indicating that the program, at a total cost of \$175,000 per year, had been largely absorbed into the College's operating budget. Earlham College is obviously an unusual case but it is described as an example of what can be

done at the undergraduate level.

3. The Limited Graduate Program

Twenty-five of the 135 colleges and universities which employ Japanese specialists offer graduate training in the field of Japanese studies, though only in a limited number of disciplines. (See Appendix 2*L*.) These institutions have approximately three to seven specialists in the field, offer Japanese at the advanced level, and maintain a minimum library holding of works in Japanese (2,000-25,000 volumes). Although they may produce an occasional Ph.D. in the field of Japanese studies, the M.A. is the prime focus of these programs. Beginning graduate programs in Japanese studies are for the most part located in institutions which have developed East Asian area programs, generally with outside funding. Many are in fact NDEA centers. Such programs require at a minimum the support of three departments with a strong Japanese commitment and associated East Asian specialists (generally in Chinese studies) in other departments.

There is considerable variation among the institutions in this category. At Bucknell University, for example, two Japan specialists and two Japanese language teachers maintain a formally organized program in Japanese studies at the undergraduate level. During the 1968-69 academic year, ninety-one students were enrolled in courses related exclusively to Japan, 318 in courses devoted substantially to Japan. Ten of Bucknell's graduating class of 269 in 1969 were majors in Japanese studies. Graduate instruction was much more limited,

however, as only one of twenty-two M.A.s awarded in 1969 was taken in Japanese studies. No Ph.D.s have been produced. The impact of external funds is dramatically illustrated in the growth of Bucknell's program. Bucknell's faculty in Japanese studies jumped from one to five between 1964 and 1965 on the basis of a federal grant. Funds from the Office of Education continue to comprise thirty-five per cent of Bucknell's total program cost of \$68,500.

To cite another example, Cornell University has two full-time and one part-time faculty who are specialists on Japan. Since 1956, however, Cornell has produced four Ph.D.'s, eighteen M.A.s and six A.B.s in the Japanese field. Whereas Bucknell's library contains 2,500 volumes in Japanese, Cornell has a holding of 17,000 volumes. Cornell's program in Japanese studies is further sustained by much larger and stronger programs in the Chinese and South East Asian fields. Thus in 1968-69 the Japanese studies program was budgeted at \$46,100 while that in Chinese studies had a budget of \$344,000. Once again, external funding has been critical to the program: forty-one per cent of the support for the program in Japanese studies comes from the federal government.

4. The Complete Graduate Program

The most advanced programs in Japanese studies are found at only the eleven institutions listed in Appendix 2e. These are characterized by staffs of eight or more full-time Japan specialists, four or more departments with a strong commitment in the Japanese field, library holdings of at least

25,000 volumes in Japanese, and strong supporting programs in East Asian studies. In addition to the several departments in which the key Japanese specialists are located, there are also four or more departments which offer some work in the Japanese field as well. Japanese language training is offered at all levels. At all eleven institutions a graduate student may specialize in Japanese studies at the masters level and take his Ph.D. in virtually any discipline in the social sciences and humanities.

The University of Chicago, for example, reports ten faculty in eight disciplines and a supporting Japanese language staff of four. Its library has 50,000 volumes in Japanese. Since 1956, Chicago has produced eleven Ph.D.'s, twenty-four M.A.s, and nineteen A.B.s with a specialization in Japan. The Chicago program is oriented primarily toward graduate training, and since 1958 well over half the enrollments in courses exclusively devoted to Japan have been graduate students. The size of Chicago's staff has doubled since 1956. Enrollments in courses dealing exclusively or substantially with Japan have increased from sixty-five in the beginning of academic 1958 to 156 in the beginning of academic 1968. Initially, the program at Chicago was sustained solely by university financial resources. For the past ten years, however, Chicago has received from ten to twenty per cent of its operating budget (\$245,000 in 1968-69) from the Ford Foundation and a similar amount from the federal government. Although Chicago has not apparently been more than forty per cent de-

pendent on external sources in any given year, external funds were a critical factor in making possible the doubling of the size of the program since 1958. It is centers like Chicago that have nourished the growth of Japan specialists in the United States, having produced seven Ph.D.s in the past five years. Nine of the eleven Ph.D.s produced by Chicago since 1956 are currently engaged in teaching.

The above categories are admittedly arbitrary but they provide the bases for a useful analysis of the Japanese field in terms of its institutional configuration. First, from the historical point of view, it should be pointed out that institutional development has come about slowly and according to certain fairly marked stages. Of the eleven institutions with the most advanced programs today, nine are mentioned in the Takaki report of 1935 as having a strong interest in Japanese studies at that time. Since the Japanese programs at these institutions did not attain their present state of development until the early 1960's, it is safe to say that it has taken some thirty years to assemble our most advanced systems of university training in the Japanese field. Furthermore, from the beginning, it is obvious that relatively few institutions served as the prime force in the expansion of the field. In the period from the end of World War II to the late 1950's the growth of the field was largely limited to these few major centers and was nourished by the original Carnegie Corporation and Rockefeller Foundation grants. Growth was slow, but a new crop of Ph.D.s was eventually trained, and this was to make

possible the next stage of development.

Stage two in the institutional expansion of Japanese studies occurred during the early 1960's as newly produced specialists, taking advantage of the availability of Ford Foundation and government funds, staffed what we have designated as the "limited graduate programs" or moved into institutions whose commitments were primarily to "undergraduate area programs." It is during these years that the greatest institutional diversification came into being. Since the mid 1960's, a third stage of growth has seen the major centers add to their staffs to round out their programs, hiring men in less developed fields or adding second and third men in the more active departments. The resulting increase in the flow of Ph.D.s has been quite noticeable. By 1970, as a consequence, it is clear that yet another stage is in the making, one in which the flow of specialists is likely to produce both a general filling out of graduate programs at the intermediate level and a noticeable increase of candidates for smaller institutions or those which have yet to develop programs in Japanese studies.

We believe, therefore, that the needs for institutional support for the field are likely to be rather different in the next decade from what they were in the one just past. The major centers, while remaining heavily dependent upon external sources of support for research grants and graduate fellowships, will be less in need of support for the acquisition of new staff. On the other hand, the institutions with less de-

veloped programs or those which have yet to undertake a commitment to Japanese studies will need assistance in their initial efforts at program building. Moreover, the new groups of specialists who will be moving into positions which may lack adequate facilities for research in the Japanese field will be dependent on outside support if they are to keep active as producing scholars. We foresee, therefore, that the emphasis during the next decade will be upon the spread of Japanese studies through the expansion of the present institutional base.

Our survey has shown that a large portion of the respondents (fifty-nine per cent) believe that there is little present need to expand the overall number of centers for advanced work on Japan although they would like to upgrade the quality of the units involved. The expansion of basic literacy about Japan at the undergraduate level, however, is less dependent upon the growth of graduate programs and facilities than upon the proliferation of introductory and survey courses at all types of institutions. The personnel need for such courses could be trained by the existing graduate centers. Again, our questionnaire responses show that the faculty at these centers are of the opinion that they could deal effectively with some fifty per cent more students than they now teach. Facilities at the institutions which provide the most advanced training are not saturated. The critical factor is recruitment of students. Such recruits into the professional ranks of the field are as apt to come from small institutions

as large. Their motivation seems determined by factors that have little to do with size of institution or excellence of graduate program. Successful recruitment, we are convinced, is dependent primarily on the academic status and legitimacy of the field, plus the availability of adequate fellowship support for a program that takes from two to three more years of study than do the conventional academic fields.

Future expansion of the field of Japanese studies will depend in large part on our capacity to move into institutions which have not as yet engaged in area programs and which by reasons of budgetary difficulties or academic disinterest have not yet admitted to the need of including Japan among their curricular concerns. Such institutions run the gamut from large state universities to small private colleges. In the absence of inducement funds, our pattern of expansion will no doubt have to repeat the familiar history of the development of Japanese studies up to the present: tentative beginnings through the addition of a single Japanese specialist to the staff of an institution, expansion through the gradual build-up of an area studies pressure group, the attaining of a critical mass of faculty and administrative support leading to a shift in institutional priorities and, hopefully, outside support. The process is long and haphazard and depends in high degree upon the energy and entrepreneurial skills of the individual scholars who must work alone in a less-than-hospitable environment to gain recognition and support for the field. There are, however, obvious ways in which the process can be

hastened and the risks minimized. Three of these deserve special attention.

Regional associations of colleges joined for area study purposes--such as the Great Lakes College Association, the Connecticut Valley Association, or the University of Tennessee group--have proven quite effective in building interest, extending the reach, and spreading the influence of a specialist over a wide area. The regional organizations and activities of the Association for Asian Studies also serve to attract notice and support for area studies and to offer a source of collegiality to those specialists lacking like-minded colleagues in their own departments or institutions.

Major centers can also serve the regions in which they are located as focal points of stimulus and communication for faculty in close-by but less well endowed institutions. The Japan Seminar at Columbia, the East Coast Japanese Economics Seminar, or the Extension Program at Michigan are examples of what can be done. Nationally available fellowships for post-doctoral summer study and research at major centers would also serve a critical need for specialists who lack the facilities to maintain their language competence or to carry out original research on their own campuses.

Finally, the profession itself should assume the responsibility to see to it that its graduate students become as proficient in a discipline as in the Japanese area. Students with such capacities can move into major university departments by virtue of their disciplinary competence whether or

not the institution is trying also to develop the field of Japanese studies. Much depends, therefore, on the quality of student recruits to the field.

Students: Their Recruitment and Support

Throughout this report two factors--recruitment and financial support--have appeared as related aspects of the most critical needs of the field of Japanese studies. If the field is to expand to meet the needs of the future, there will have to be a substantial influx of students. How are they to be recruited and, even more importantly, how are they to be supported during the long course of study involved in obtaining the doctorate with Japanese specialization?

We have already noted that members of the profession offering graduate instruction report the possibility of handling appreciably more students than they now have. The present flow of students into the field does not, therefore, exceed the capacities of the training system. The argument is often made in academic circles that, if there is a felt national need, student recruits will flow in that direction. By this standard the inability of Japanese studies to demonstrate a large backlog of students who have been denied training would seem to demonstrate that the field is not in need of expansion. Our view, however, is that there is a demonstrable and urgent national need, that the case for expansion of Japanese studies is irrefutable, and that the failure of students spontaneously to enter the field is a reflection of special factors which inhibit recruitment.

These special factors are:

1. the limited base for generating interest in the nation's colleges;
2. the formidable effort and training time required of the would-be specialist in Japanese studies;
3. the state of the job market for Japanese specialists, i.e., the student's assessment of whether it is worth in a long-term sense the added time and effort to undertake the lengthy training required;
4. the general inadequacy of fellowship support for this extended training period; and
5. the lack of opportunities to learn about Japan, at first hand, particularly to travel to Japan and there acquire a commitment to the field and some immediate sense of the importance of Japan to the world's future.

All but the second of the above factors are amenable to improvement through the kinds of financial support which have been mentioned in the previous pages. The limited base of interest and the state of the job market are obviously related to the adequacy of support for Japanese studies in colleges and universities across the country. Where direct student support is concerned two kinds of fellowship programs are required, one long-term, the other short-term. Up to now foundation and government sources have been concerned almost exclusively with long-term fellowship support for doctoral candidates. This must surely be given continued priority.

But we have come to the conclusion that a new need has also become critical; that is, the short-term travel grant, generally for the summer, which would permit both undergraduate and graduate students to visit Japan. The problem is that of overcoming the lack of first-hand acquaintance with Japan which is the common lot of most Americans. Consider the advantages of France when it comes to gaining the favorable attention of our youth. The relative ease with which students can travel to France for a summer and the numerous junior-year-abroad programs produce a much larger body of potential recruits for the field of French studies. Today when war or occupation no longer press Japan upon the American consciousness, any comparable opportunity of developing recruits to the Japanese field through first-hand familiarity is almost totally lacking. The differences in cost between crossing the Pacific and crossing the Atlantic are a very tangible thing. Combined with the cultural gap separating Japan from the United States, they become an inhibitory factor of great magnitude.

Having stated the need, let it be said that in the last few years a number of ways have been found to facilitate student travel to Japan. Some colleges and universities have developed "year-abroad" programs in conjunction with Japanese universities. Thus Waseda University has offered training to students from the Great Lakes College Association, the California State Colleges, Oregon and Washington Universities. Sophia and Notre Dame are similarly linked, as are International Christian University and the University of California.

Five-year B.A. programs at Princeton and Yale also send a selection of students to Japan. The numbers involved in any of these programs are not great, but a pattern is emerging.

More common are the summer-abroad programs, many of them facilitated by the Council on International Exchange. These are mostly self-pay package programs of six to ten weeks involving study at such institutions as Sophia, Keio, Asian, and Doshisha universities together with travel and often some family living. Institutions which have organized such programs with or without institutional affiliation include:

Adelphi & Hofstra
Alaska McRhodes College
Big Bend College
Brigham Young University
Carleton College
Chapman College
Cornell University
Fairleigh Dickinson University
Florida Presbyterian
Georgetown University
Gustavus Adolphus
University of Hawaii
Northern Illinois University
Lewis and Clark
City University of New York
Seton Hall University
Stanford University
University of Utah
University of Washington
Western College for Women

The list indicates the mixed nature of such summer programs. Most are organized primarily to offer a generally broadening experience to students. Few are in any sense pre-specialization introductions to Japanese studies. Yet the number of students who have returned from such experiences with a new found commitment to Japanese studies is significant.

The problem with these travel-study programs is that they are too little integrated with recruitment and early training for the field of Japanese studies. For most of them the possibility of stimulating a genuine career interest in Japanese studies is decidedly incidental to the main aim of liberal education. What is needed from the standpoint of Japanese studies is a nationally available program of summer travel and study in Japan closely articulated with existing Japanese studies programs. Scholarship support is essential since the best students with a potential academic interest in Japan either do not have the money or have other, and often highly competitive, possibilities for spending their summers. Appropriate facilities for study in Japan already exist and can be expanded. Programs have been established at Sophia University and International Christian University. The Kyoto center for undergraduate training currently being planned by the Council on International Educational Exchange should also prove helpful, though its concern is with students from teachers' colleges. The Tokyo Inter-University Center for Japanese Studies is another obvious possibility.

If the undergraduate level of student recruitment and training is poorly supported, the same is true of the graduate level to a less acute degree. Since the 1950's several general fellowship programs have been in operation: the Ford Foundation's Foreign Area Fellowship Program, the government's National Defense Language Fellowships, the Fulbright program, and the NDEA-related Fulbright-Hayes awards for study abroad.

(See Appendices 4a, 4b, 4c, 4e.) The distribution of pre-doctoral awards for Japanese specialists under these programs is shown in the following statistics:

	<u>Ford</u>	<u>Fulbright</u>	<u>NDFL</u>	<u>Fulbright-Hayes</u>	<u>Total</u>
1963	17	8	80	9	114
1967	11	8	172	10	201

The total of all study grants for 1969 remains at the 1967 level. The number, when augmented by awards from universities and other sources, still does not meet the needs of the current graduate population. As Appendix 4a shows, moreover, the funds available for fellowships in Japanese studies amount to only about a third of the total allocation for East Asia as a whole.

In actual funds the current support amounts to roughly \$1,000,000 annually from government and foundation sources. We estimate that the institutions at which students in the Japanese field are studying may provide another \$800,000 as fellowships and assistantships (a good deal of this coming from earlier foundation grants). The estimated cost of supporting the approximately 400 M.A. and Ph.D. candidates who we believe are now enrolled throughout the country runs to \$1.8 million in a given year. Any increase in student numbers will naturally call for a commensurate increase in scholarships and fellowships. But to increase substantially the size of the field in terms of professional specialists at work in colleges and universities would require very sizeable increases in stu-

dent support. For instance, to bring about a doubling of the size of the field in the next decade, which is a technically feasible objective, would require, as Appendix 6 shows, an increase in fellowship budgets of between three and four fold. Here in essence is the crux of the problem of expansion for the field. There exists a nearly perfect correlation between the number of fellowships available and student numbers in the field.

Little more need be said about the problem of student recruitment and support. At this point government grants account for about five-sixths of the non-institutional fellowships. The need for this source to be continued and expanded rather than cut or eliminated is obvious. The threatened diminution in the number of Ford and Fulbright awards available to Japanese studies is serious, not so much in numbers, though these are appreciable, as in the types of fellowship which would be withdrawn from the field. Both provide highly desirable and flexible all-expense travel-study stipends. These two programs have in fact provided support for the final stages of training for a majority of the best scholars who have entered the field since 1959. (See Appendices 4c-4e.)

The Problem of Language Training

One of the principal limiting factors in the development of Japanese studies in the United States is the difficulty of the language. There is, of course, a general problem of practically total unfamiliarity. Japanese is simply not commonly encountered in the American environment, and few American

youth are spontaneously attracted to studying it. But in addition, for a native speaker of English to master Japanese sufficiently to enable him to use the language readily in his chosen field of specialization is a very formidable task. It requires a far greater expenditure of time and effort than the achievement of a comparable degree of proficiency in almost any other major language of the world. (One estimate puts the number of "contact hours" for proficiency in Japanese at twice the amount required for a comparable proficiency in Russian and six times the amount for French.) As a result, graduate students continue to be plagued by language problems even while they pursue advanced courses in their chosen discipline. Unable to allot sufficient time with sufficient intensity to do the job efficiently, they are still acquiring the language at a point where they should be utilizing the results of language proficiency for research purposes.

The seriousness of this problem is attested by constantly recurring comments in the recently compiled questionnaire results and reports. Professors complain that their students cannot handle Japanese well enough for practical use, and students comment on their own inadequacies and complain about ineffective language programs. Graduate students are particularly frustrated by the gap between language learning and language content, the difficulty of moving from routine language drill to use of the language for intellectually satisfying purposes.

A significant percentage of senior specialists in the

field consists of persons who had the advantage of intensive Japanese language training during World War II. Students today, with few exceptions, must study their Japanese in courses organized within the framework of regular university curricula. The intensity that was the rule in the war-time programs has become the rare exception. The critical distinction between learning to manipulate a language and using a language effectively in the learning and research processes has not received sufficient attention in program organization or in the development of teaching methods.

Naturally the war-time circumstances will not be repeated. Motivation and engagement must be created in a different manner. The ingredients of a peacetime environment conducive to the intensive study of the Japanese language must be created out of such elements as: opportunities for travel and study in Japan, improved language teaching which really motivates students, and adequate financial support.

The language problem, too, must be viewed in the perspective of considerable change over the last twenty years. (See Appendices 2c-2e.) Modern Language Association statistics show that some seventy-five colleges and universities offered courses in the Japanese language in 1968 and that total class enrollments numbered 4,322 against 1,746 in 1960. These figures are deceptive, however, for when we turn to the number of graduate students in Japanese language courses we find that only twenty-three institutions offer appropriate training and that enrollments total only 565. The distribution of under-

graduate enrollments also indicates that well over fifty per cent occur in Hawaii or in West Coast communities where interest in the language reflects the presence of large concentrations of Japanese-Americans. A further way of putting enrollment figures in Japanese language courses into national perspective is to note that in 1965 enrollments in Russian totalled 33,710 (more than eleven times as many as in Japanese). College enrollments in French passed the 200,000 mark in 1960 and continue to climb.

When it comes to the actual teaching of Japanese and the availability of adequate teaching materials, the field is in considerably better shape. As Samuel E. Martin has pointed out in his paper prepared for the Educational Resources Information Center Clearinghouse for Linguistics (Appendix 71), there have been a number of noteworthy advances in the preparation of texts and other teaching materials and in the organization of Japanese language teachers in an effort to bring greater uniformity and improved quality to their work. The formation of the Association of Teachers of Japanese in 1963 has been a milestone in this effort. This association reflects the concern of the profession that teaching be handled by trained language instructors and according to accepted standards.

Membership in the Association of Teachers of Japanese is indicative of the state of the field of Japanese language instruction in the United States during the 1960's. Whereas in 1934 language teachers numbered at most eight, the Associa-

tion (which itself is not all-inclusive) lists 160 members. The capacities of these teachers are for the most part used conventionally at one or another of the seventy-five institutions which offer Japanese language to undergraduates. There have been, however, a number of special attempts to reach students whose institutions do not provide such opportunities or to provide intensive training during summer months. An example of the former is the Princeton Cooperative Undergraduate Program in Critical Languages. Begun in 1963 with Carnegie Corporation support (Ford Foundation funds have later been added), it provides the opportunity for a year's language and area training to undergraduates from other colleges on a visiting basis. In this way twenty-four highly motivated students have studied Japanese at Princeton since the inception of the program. The University of Hawaii's East-West Center maintains a somewhat analogous junior visiting year program which offers intensive language instruction.

Programs for summer study had their start with the early area programs. As these were converted into NDEA language and area centers there has been something of a consolidation of such efforts with emphasis on regional distribution. Summer programs in 1968 were held at Columbia, Michigan, Wisconsin, Stanford, and Texas. In 1970 the programs will be held at Columbia, Middlebury, Minnesota, Stanford, and Washington at St. Louis.

Language training in Japan has always been a desirable objective. In recent years limited opportunities for such

training have arisen with the establishment of language schools in Japan which offer intensive training in a Japanese environment. Japanese government sponsored schools so far have directed their attention primarily to students from Southeast Asia. (See Appendix 4f.) But programs at International Christian University, Waseda University, Keio University, and Sophia University have been well attended by Americans, not all of whom have been committed to Japanese studies. We look forward to the day when opportunities for language study in Japan are expanded by the Japanese themselves and when Japanese government scholarships are offered in considerable number to students from the United States.

For American students at this point the most significant facility for language study in Japan is the Inter-University Center for Japanese Language Studies in Tokyo. Support for this center, which has been administered since 1963 by Stanford University, has come from the Ford Foundation and most recently from the Office of Education. Since its inception the Center has provided instruction for more than 138 graduate students and sixty-two undergraduates from twenty institutions. (See Appendix 2f.) It is now fighting for its existence, and its financial problems highlight the extreme difficulties posed by the language problem and by the costliness of adequate language instruction. The Inter-University Center has been funded by two Ford Foundation grants totalling \$529,095. In six years of operation the total cost of maintaining the center exceeded \$660,000. The average cost per

student per year ranged from \$3,879 to \$6,346. Yet cost is not the only problem affecting the Center. The 138 graduate students trained there represent less than half of the total number of Ph.D. candidates who have gone to Japan for study during the years since 1963. This is the result of two factors--the inability of the Center to meet the needs of all such graduate students, but more importantly, the fact that many students "cannot afford" to take the additional time for the kind of language study which the Center offers. The acquisition of proficiency in the Japanese language is such a lengthy and laborious task that many graduate students, having already spent two or more years in intensive language work at home and having exhausted their eligibility for further fellowship support, feel obliged to plunge into their field research whether they are adequately prepared in a linguistic sense or not. Whatever difficulties the Inter-University Center has experienced, there can be no doubt that it is a facility which has enormously benefited the field of Japanese studies. It can play an even more important role in the future if it can be continued. Every effort must be made to find the necessary funds. It would be hard to find another facility more deserving of long term governmental or foundation support.

The language problem thus breaks down into several related parts. Student support comes first, but there is also need for more effective training in the United States and a more effective articulation between such training and that available in Japan. With respect to training in the United

States, a number of concrete suggestions have come from the survey conference on language teaching. (See Appendix 71.)

First there is need to discover ways to utilize more efficiently the existing resources in this country. On the basis of consultation with disciplinary specialists as to the desired level of language competence for their students, a rational estimate of the number of hours of language training required to achieve such goals must be made, together with a timetable for the most effective scheduling of such hours within a student's overall program. Every effort must be made to encourage the acquisition of basic language skills on an intensive basis as early in a student's career as possible.

Japanese language programs in undergraduate colleges-- and even in secondary schools--should therefore be given a priority status, in recognition of the fact that the student who begins his study of Japanese early acquires it more easily and achieves useful competence sooner. But if such instruction is to be worth-while it must be carried out by thoroughly competent instructors who not only are skilled language teachers but who are also a significant force in recruiting good students to the field. Poor instruction, besides being scholastically worthless, leads to frustration and loss of commitment.

Consequently, every effort must be made to increase the number of professionally trained teachers of Japanese. For this purpose the Survey Conference on Teaching of Language suggested that a Center be established in the United States

for the training or retraining of qualified Japanese instructors. A large portion of these, we assume, would be Japanese who will be teaching their native language as a foreign language. Such a center would concern itself with the most modern techniques of language training and would itself conduct continuing research in this area in consultation with other organizations and groups concerned with foreign-language training. If the teachers' training program were to lead to a Master's degree, this should significantly improve the status of the native speaker--the language instructor who at present encounters serious problems of continuing employment and advancement within American universities.

As part of its program for training and research, the center could also train a limited number of students in demonstration classes. Accordingly, it would not only produce trained instructors available for employment by programs throughout the country, but it would also provide training for students from those colleges and universities that were not in a position to conduct their own basic language programs.

Ideally, then, we conceive of the need for a multi-level and multi-institutional structure of language training for the American student involving training both locally and centrally in the United States combined with two periods of study in Japan. Introductory work would be started in the student's own institution by instructors professionally trained for the purpose at a central institute. Students with a beginning knowledge of the language would be offered the

possibility of a summer intensive language and area program in Japan. Intermediate work would be handled at the student's institution or at the central institute in the United States. Advanced and intensive intermediate training would be undertaken in Japan at such a facility as the Inter-University Center. Such are the demanding requirements of a difficult field of study.

The Field as Research and Publications

As we noted earlier, the field of Japanese studies in the United States conceived in terms of its research product has literally transformed itself since the 1940's. This has been the work in the main of individuals, working primarily as individuals rather than as part of any planned group effort. By far the greatest amount of new research has taken the form of Ph.D. dissertations. What the total output of Ph.D. dissertations in Japanese studies has been since 1947 is in part a matter of judgment as to what constitutes work done in the field. The bibliographical investigation conducted by Frank Shulman of the University of Michigan has disclosed a total of 1,103 titles of dissertations which are in some way related to Japan. Many of these, however, are not strictly the work of specialists in Japanese studies since they are written without the use of Japanese materials or the Japanese language. The figure our more narrow definition of what constitutes a work in the Japanese field leaves us with is 348 with another 107 dissertations in preparation. The completed works are distributed by discipline as follows:

History	112
Political Science	54
Economics	38
Literature	34
Languages and Linguistics	25
Anthropology	19
Religion	17
Sociology	16
Art	10
Geography	5
Education	4
Psychology	1

The pattern of distribution by disciplines reflects rather accurately the general contours of the published product of Japanese studies. It somewhat understates the art and literature fields, since these are stimulated directly by the publishing industry. The high concentration in the humanities, particularly history, is what we would expect. The relative scarcity of work in the social sciences, especially sociology, is also no surprise. These figures point up certain obvious imbalances within the field as a whole which can only be remedied by consciously planned efforts. The record shows on the one hand that our scholarly knowledge about Japan has increased tremendously since the end of World War II and that for many fields (for instance politics, modern history, economic development and international relations) the coverage is several generations deep. In other areas it is still quite thin and spotty. In terms of coverage, therefore, the field as a whole has a long way yet to go.

This is less the case when it comes to quality. The work of scholars is naturally subject to individual idiosyncracies. Yet on the whole, the scholarly product of the field

has been steadily improving. Today it is expected of Ph D. candidates that they make full use of Japanese materials in their original form and that they add to these an original contribution which makes the work significant to both the Japanese and American scholarly worlds. This means that increasingly new research is being designed to answer questions which are considered important for theoretical or comparative reasons, not, as so often in the past, simply because of the availability of accessible data. In this sense Japanese studies have come of age. Given the present capacities of American researchers and the prodigious product of Japanese scholarship, there are few areas of knowledge about Japan which could not be adequately explored if there is the desire to do so, and sufficient manpower and support for the task.

The nine disciplinary survey conferences convened by the Joint Committee were concerned in large part with questions of gaps or inadequacies in our research and knowledge of the several fields of Japanese studies. Since their reports are included as appendices there is no need to summarize their findings in detail. Clearly each discipline presents a different profile and has its own peculiar problems and priorities. The economists are few in number but are perhaps the most closely integrated with their Japanese counterparts. Their capacity to follow up major research themes according to their own priorities and their ability to provide adequate coverage of their field are consequently unusually high considering the small number of scholars in the field. Sociolo-

gists are even fewer in number but the state of their discipline in this country and particularly in Japan leads to major dissatisfactions in terms of both the quantity and quality of work being done. Humanists are concerned chiefly with problems of coverage and originality. Historical coverage is still quite spotty and the tendency to produce descriptive, and hence derivative, studies is still strong.

In all fields there are major gaps and important problems requiring attention. The survey reports have pointed out many of these. But for all fields there is also a common set of problems which are indicative of the current state of Japanese studies. No longer is the strictly descriptive or data-gathering approach considered a priority need. Our capacity to get answers of a descriptive sort is taken for granted. It is the more theoretical problems which are of primary concern to the field. Modern historians as well as specialists in art history, for instance, are engaged in a search for techniques which will free their scholarship from dependence on ethnocentric Western concepts. They question whether such generalizing concepts as feudalism, modernization, democracy, archaic and baroque are useful tools of inquiry. Their search is for a new vocabulary which will assimilate the observations and findings which emerge from Japanese data with the familiar concepts and categories which are the accepted axioms of American social science and humanistic inquiry. This effort to move beyond an area study base is a common denominator of all disciplines engaged in Japanese studies.

Above all, the members of the field are agreed that opportunities are needed for a concerted attack on problems of conceptualization, methodology and collaborative research. While there is no feeling that individual scholarship need be abandoned, there is a desire in most fields for more exchange of information in order to heighten awareness of critical conceptual problems and to help close the gap between area and disciplinary approaches. This has led to a call for greater methodological and theoretical self-consciousness among the sub-fields of Japanese studies.

There are mechanisms for facilitating such self-consciousness. The activities of the Conference on Modern Japan, which held six seminars and several smaller meetings between 1961 and 1968, has helped stimulate this kind of interchange of ideas within the profession. These seminars were each designed to bring together Japanese specialists of a single discipline or a group of related disciplines with a few Japanese scholars and at least one theoretically oriented scholar who was not a Japanese specialist. This formula has been enlarged in the series of conferences presently being planned by the Joint Committee on Japanese Studies. These will emphasize comparative studies and bi-national collaboration. A larger proportion of Japanese scholars will be involved, and the relations between Japanese studies and other areas and disciplines will be a major focus of attention.

Another promising research development is the launching of a series of United States-Japan collaborative research pro-

jects in the social sciences funded jointly by the Japanese Ministry of Education and the United States Department of State's Office of Educational and Cultural Affairs. The research projects are planned and administered by two academic committees, one the Japan Council for the Advancement of Science in Tokyo and the other the Joint Committee on Japanese Studies in America. So far studies have been made of comparative levels of living in the two countries and of source materials relating to the postwar Occupation period in Japan. Future projects already planned will involve joint studies of environmental control, sociolinguistics, and the mutual national images of each other held by the American and Japanese peoples.

The trend toward joint or cooperative research has been accentuated both by the importance of the results of such research and because of the growing interconnectedness of the American and Japanese scholarly worlds. American scholars maintain remarkably close and cordial contacts with their Japanese colleagues. In this respect the Japanese field enjoys a special advantage over most other areas in having as their counterparts a body of highly sophisticated and readily accessible scholars. Yet few Americans are engaged in collaborative research with Japanese.

There is also very little cooperative research involving joint ventures by area and disciplinary specialists within the United States. One of the more hopeful responses to this problem is to be found in the American Historical Society's

program of bi-national inquiry organized by its Committee on American-East Asian Relations. Through a series of conferences preceded by summer language and area training this seeks to draw disciplinary specialists into a more sophisticated study of American-East Asian relations through the addition of an area component to their professional skills.

This list of group activities either in the form of conferences or research programs could be extended. But this would only serve to distract attention from the major conclusions resulting from our review of the field, namely the precariousness of current research efforts in terms of their financial support and the widespread sense of dissatisfaction among members of the field with their research opportunities and prospects.

Support for research can be broken down into several categories. A large percentage takes the form of pre-doctoral travel and research grants. The sources of such support--Fulbright, Fulbright-Hays, Foreign Area Fellowship Program fellowships, and the National Defense Foreign Language Fellowships --and their respective contributions have been noted earlier. Post-doctoral research has always found itself in a more precarious state. Sources of support outside the scholar's own academic institution are relatively few and are generally subject to national competition. This is true of grants under the joint ACLS-SSRC Asian Program, the Office of Education programs, the Fulbright program and general sources such as Guggenheim, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the

National Science Foundation. Appendix 4d shows that the ACLS-SSRC Asian Program was able to make only forty-seven grants from among 200 applicants between 1958 and 1968. The total amount of money involved was under \$190,000 or approximately \$4,000 per recipient. Institutional support is most apt to come from research funds supplied by Carnegie or Rockefeller in support of area programs or from Ford Foundation institutional grants. Estimates of the total annual support for post-doctoral research in Japanese studies amounts to less than \$400,000--about one-third of what is available for Chinese studies. (See Appendix 5a.)

The results of our questionnaires are very clear in this connection. First, post-doctoral research funding is considered inadequate by two-thirds of the profession. Second, the availability of funds and of an atmosphere conducive to research is restricted almost exclusively to the large centers which have their own area programs. The lot of the lone scholar, never an enviable one, is even more lonely when it comes to access to research funds. This casts a somewhat different light on the statement made earlier that the research products of the Japanese field are primarily the work of individual scholars working alone. For if we take the total of dissertation research and published post-doctoral research, it is clear that the vast majority of such works were stimulated, supported by, and to some extent molded by one or another of the primary academic centers. When it comes to research, it is the major centers that have been most effective in generating

support.

The future of research funding in Japanese studies at this point seems far from bright, particularly if the indications of retrenchment by both the Ford Foundation and the government are to be taken seriously. The year 1970 brings most major centers within two or three years of the exhaustion of the institutional grants for area studies made by the Ford Foundation some nine years ago. It is hard to exaggerate the effects of these institutional grants in releasing money for research purposes. While not all of these have been used directly for research subsidy, most of the so-called "institutional support" for individual research was indirectly provided by Ford money. Unless government support for area centers materializes, the funds available for research in Japanese studies will be very substantially reduced in the next few years. If this is the case, the overall quality of research in the Japanese field is certain to be severely affected. It is largely produced at the major centers.

Ways must also be found to assist the "loner" scholar so as to encourage his scholarly contributions to the field. The possibility of bringing such scholars to the leading regional centers for occasional periods of residence has been suggested. This would, of course, entail the availability of funds for their support. From the point of view of such scholars the prospect of diminishing funds for the ACLS-SSRC Asian Grants Program is a heavy blow. As it is, these funds permit support for a bare twenty per cent of the annual appli-

cants and even then at a rate of funding far below the needed amount.

External funding for research, either through a scholar's own institution or through nationally administered programs of research support, is critical, therefore, to the maintenance of the field. This is true in at least two senses. First, it is essential to the maintenance of morale, standards, and recruitment. Second, it is through research that the field advances. Without research it is certain to wither and, eventually, to die.

The Library Problem

The assembling of collections of Japanese language materials for training and research purposes has been a critical necessity for the development of a professional level of Japanese studies in the United States. Of all the field's needs, however, external support for library development has been the most difficult to obtain. Since 1958 it has been possible to acquire modest governmental aid from the NDEA Center budgets while others have applied a portion of their Ford Foundation institutional grants to building up their library holdings. In the main, however, about eighty-eight per cent of the support for library acquisitions and maintenance has come directly from institutional budgets.

Separate figures on the cost of maintaining existing Japanese library collections in this country are not available because most such collections are merged with Chinese language collections. For such combined East Asian collections, how-

ever, the following figures indicate overall costs and the sources of support involved. (See Appendix 8b.) Total expenses for books and salaries in 1968-1969 was \$4,547,221. Of this total, institutions provided \$4,015,072 (or eighty-eight per cent), NDEA Center budgets provided \$144,535 (or four per cent), and foundations provided \$328,279 (or seven per cent).

It is difficult to define in precise terms the national need when it comes to library collections. Overall size is only one factor; there are also problems of distribution and accessibility. According to statistics compiled by T. H. Tsien, however, the present overall condition of Japanese collections throughout the country is as follows (see Appendix 8a). Total holdings (including the Library of Congress and non-academic institutions) numbered 1,615,238 volumes at the end of 1968. These are spread over fifty-nine institutions of which thirty-eight are universities. The Library of Congress' collection with 485,957 volumes is by far the largest. The largest university collection belongs to the University of California at Berkeley with estimated holdings of 126,000 volumes. In all, thirteen university libraries have holdings of more than 20,000 volumes: Berkeley, the University of California at Los Angeles, Chicago, Columbia, Harvard, Hawaii, Maryland, Michigan, Princeton, Stanford, Washington University, the University of Washington, and Yale. The remaining twenty-five university libraries have holdings of under 20,000 volumes apiece in Japanese. What this means is that the United States can claim at most only fourteen research libraries

which are barely adequate for some professional purposes. Of these only the Library of Congress has reasonably comprehensive holdings. Its size and adequacy is dwarfed by comparison with the three million volume collection of Tokyo University. Even the largest of our university collections falls far short of matching the three to four hundred thousand volume size of the other major university libraries in Japan. Collections which fall below the 20,000 volume mark must be considered primarily teaching libraries.

Aside from the problems of size and research adequacy Japanese collections in the United States face serious difficulties of staffing. Dr. Warren Tsuneishi of the Library of Congress has estimated that there is a total of 110 professional librarians in the United States working exclusively or primarily with Japanese language holdings. Of these some fifty work for the Library of Congress. There remain only sixty librarians to staff the other fifty-eight institutions which possess Japanese collections. Obviously these collections are most inadequately staffed. Most of them must make do with untrained, temporary, or barely qualified assistance. In early 1969 a survey showed an urgent need for at least thirteen Japanese librarians. This scarcity of trained library personnel has been apparent from the beginning and has led to acute problems in the form of massive backlogs of uncatalogued acquisitions, inadequate and incomplete card catalogues and, except at a few major centers, an almost complete lack of the sort of library services which would assist stu-

dents in learning how to use Japanese materials and faculty in their research.

Several recent developments in the library field give some hope that at least the more critical problems of staffing, cataloguing, and acquisition may be eased in the future. The first is the new initiative shown by the Committee on East Asian Libraries of the Association for Asian Studies in promoting consultation and cooperation among libraries throughout the United States. One result has been the holding of an Institute of Far Eastern Librarianship during the summer of 1969 at the University of Chicago. The institute, held for six weeks, gave special and intensive training in the handling of Japanese materials to a group of eleven professional librarians. Another result has been the convening of the first Japan-United States Conference on Libraries and Information Science in Higher Education in Tokyo in May 1969. The recommendations stemming from this conference have pointed the way to a number of at least partial solutions to problems of acquisition, staffing, cataloguing, exchange of information, and bibliographical assistance through cooperative arrangements between Japan and the United States. (See Appendices 8c and 8d.) Still another helpful development has been the program of "shared and centralized cataloguing" which the Library of Congress has worked out with the National Diet Library in Tokyo. Since 1968 the Library of Congress has maintained an office in Tokyo which processes library catalogue cards for new books which are then made broadly available to libraries

in the United States.

If the field of Japanese studies is to be expanded in coming years to meet the national need, further library development and improvement in library services must be an integral part of that expansion. The projected needs are clear. A conservative requirement would be the creation of at least three major research libraries capable of providing the scholar with all materials necessary for advanced research--each one with holdings of about a quarter to a half million volumes. The three would best be regionally distributed. In addition, if there are to be enough regional centers of Japanese studies to nourish a healthy expansion in manpower and research, it would be necessary to upgrade the capacities of less developed centers which exist today. At least twenty (as against a current eight) universities should possess research libraries of 40,000 or more volumes. A third level of institutions with less extensive programs of Japanese studies would need libraries of at least 20,000 volumes--the minimum size for a teaching library with limited research capacity. The number of librarians professionally competent in the Japanese field should be increased by at least another fifty persons and this would necessitate the creation of training programs in this country and the strengthening of cooperative ties with library circles in Japan. Finally, since sizeable concentrations of Japanese materials will be found only in major cities and centers, facilities for inter-library loans, duplicating services, the preparation of national available union cata-

logues, and other cooperative devices should be given a high priority.

In sum, some of the current problems of the library field are organizational and can be handled internally by cooperative planning and arrangements for regional distribution and specialization among libraries. But the necessary expansions of staff and size of holdings can only take place if library budgets for Japanese collections are substantially increased. Some of these problems can, and we believe should, be handled by a readjustment of priorities within major libraries. Japanese language materials are still treated as "exotic" in most university libraries. A recent study shows that only two per cent of the foreign language acquisitions of American research libraries were Japanese--the same as for the Benelux countries. In the library field as well as elsewhere, the trend in the next decade must be away from a Eurocentric orientation which places the study of Japan in a special category and considers the acquisition of Japanese materials a special concession to "area interests." The importance of Japanese scholarship in the social sciences and humanities must be recognized for what it is--a major creative contribution to our knowledge of science and the human condition. This cannot be left to the universities which are already staggering under the burden of maintaining their present library collections.

Communication with Japanese Scholars

In 1966, nine hundred and eighty-six English-language

books were translated into Japanese and published. The reverse flow, translations of Japanese books into English, numbered twenty-five. These figures reflect quite accurately the discrepancy in flows of information between the two countries. The need to stimulate translations of Japanese scholarly materials into English has concerned leaders in the field of Japanese studies for many years. (See Appendix 9.) Some advances have been made recently through the work of the East-West Center at Hawaii and through the program of simultaneous publication of Japanese books in both languages by the Tokyo University Press and a number of American university presses. Yet the overall number of titles translated from Japanese remains very small and the selection of titles has not done justice to the most distinguished products of Japanese scholarship. The problem of quality in translated works is also troublesome, since frequently the work of Japanese scholars has been seriously misrepresented as a result of poor translation. Few areas of mutual concern to Japanese and American scholars are in as much need of cooperative attention as this. The financial difficulties faced by the Journal of Political and Social Ideas in Japan, a pioneering and exceptionally valuable attempt to cope with this problem, illustrate the need for subsidies calculated to stimulate and increase the exchange of ideas between the two scholarly worlds through translations.

IV

CONCLUSIONS AND SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The academic field of Japanese studies has grown from a mere handful of specialists in 1934 to a membership of over 500 in 1970. The number of students taking Japanese language courses at colleges and universities has grown from under a thousand in 1958 to over four thousand at the present time. Yet Japan's growth in economic power during these same years dwarfs these figures and points up the continuing failure of the American academic world to give adequate attention to the study of Japan. Japan today represents the third greatest concentration of economic power in the world, its scholars are active in every field of research. These facts cannot be ignored.

Japanese specialists are at work in only 135 of the more than fifteen hundred colleges and universities in America, and developed programs of Japanese studies are available in only sixty-one of these. All told, there are only eleven institutions which have assembled the requisite staff, language facilities, and library collections to count as major centers of graduate training and research. To bring Japanese studies up to the level of Russian studies in America would take a ten-fold expansion of the existing base.

The development of Japanese studies in the United States until 1958 was unusually dependent upon the accident of a war. In subsequent years it has been heavily reliant on large scale foundation support and more recently on government

assistance. The 1970's show portents of crisis in the field of Japanese studies: financial and intellectual support is endangered despite Japan's continued growth in world importance. It is the hope of the Joint Committee on Japanese Studies that its report has demonstrated the importance of the field for which it speaks and the necessity of continued expansion during the 1970's. It is in fact our belief that at least a doubling of the manpower presently devoted to Japanese studies is called for in the next decade and that this is not an unreasonable goal given the present state of the field.

Our survey has shown that the institutional base of the Japanese field is narrow. But it contains the potential of growth in several directions. First, it would require the addition of only about fifty specialists to the larger of the institutions which have limited graduate programs to double the number of universities capable of mounting advanced programs in the field. Another fifty or sixty specialists added to some of the minimal programs would suffice to double the number of institutions able to offer intermediate programs of Japanese studies at the graduate level. In other words it would take only about 100 new specialists to bring about a doubling of the field at the upper levels of training. This is not an unrealistic possibility when one considers that the number of Ph.D. dissertations in progress for which we have information is one hundred and seven, a figure which we suspect is considerably understated.

Our attention, however, has not been limited to the

graduate level of study, for we are as concerned with the broad spread of knowledge about Japan as with the training of specialists. Expansion at the level of college liberal arts courses and undergraduate area programs is a prime necessity both for the general educational impact on the country and as a means of expanding the base of recruitment. Here again it would take only another 135 individuals moving into new positions at institutions which have yet to enter the field to double the number of colleges and universities offering courses on Japan. Clearly at both academic levels lack of manpower is not the problem. The next ten years can easily produce enough new specialists if support for training is made available and if colleges and universities can be induced to absorb them.

Clearly there is no single or simple solution to the problem of assuring the kind of national support which would bring about a doubling of the size and capacities of the Japanese field over a ten-year period. Where the allocation of financial responsibilities is concerned, we suggest that there are certain fairly clear-cut principles:

1. Basic and traditional operating costs should be borne by universities.
2. Since international education is so closely and obviously linked to the pursuit of broad nationwide goals, the federal government has special responsibilities of a continuing sort in this field.
3. Foundations should concentrate on investments which

would produce innovation, diversification, or enrichment of the field and should in most cases be able to regard their commitments as temporary.

With these principles in mind, if one breaks down by function the needs of the field of Japanese studies described in the body of the report, a definite pattern of allocations emerges.

1. Academic Institutions

a. For existing staff, support should be a university responsibility.

b. For new staff--especially in such currently undermanned fields as economics, sociology and psychology--it may be necessary to provide inducement money on a temporary basis. This might appropriately come from either foundation sources, the budgets of NDEA centers or other such federal sources. In any event such inducement funds should be available for no more than three years, after which the university should assume responsibility.

The same is true for program costs such as non-academic staff and operational expenses. For established programs these should be a university responsibility. For new or transitional programs, assistance from foundations or the government may be necessary for a period that should probably not exceed five years.

2. Support of Faculty in Small Institutions

The individual specialist working alone in an institution which provides no program support finds himself in a par-

ticularly difficult position when it comes to keeping alive an active research interest or designing a satisfying program of study for his students. As an increasing number of professionally trained specialists in the Japanese field take up new positions, it will be necessary to devise ways of linking such persons to nearby major centers and to provide means of enriching their teaching programs. Outside sources of support, chiefly from foundations, will be needed for summer faculty study grants and for a variety of programs of institutional cooperation on a regional basis.

3. Student Fellowships

While some student fellowships will continue to be made available on a competitive basis by individual universities, by far the largest proportion of this expense will have to come from external sources. The major source should continue to be the federal government with selective assistance from the foundations for innovational and enrichment purposes. Such fellowships should be tenable both in the United States and Japan and should be available for periods of study totaling as much as six years. Provisions should also be made for short term fellowships of a summer or one or two term duration, for either undergraduate or beginning graduate students which would permit study of intensive summer language and area programs in this country or in Japan. These would serve as a recruiting as well as a training device. We suggest, therefore, that such short term grants be made available in addition to the existing fellowships such as the Foreign Area

Training Fellowships, the National Defense Language Fellowships, and those associated with the Fulbright, Fulbright-Hays, National Endowment for the Humanities, National Science Foundation, Social Science Research Council and American Council of Learned Societies' programs.

4. Costs of Language Training

While basically these would be borne by the universities, some of the apparatus involved is national in scope and importance and should be funded first perhaps on an experimental basis by foundations and then on an established basis by the federal government. The Inter-University Language Center in Tokyo is a case in point. It has so far been financed by the Ford Foundation and the eleven universities most immediately involved. It has demonstrated both its feasibility and great national value. It is appropriate that its support should now be taken over by the government. The same formula might well be appropriate for the national Japanese Language Training Center proposed for the United States.

5. Research and Publication Costs

Involved are the costs of financing faculty research projects of either an individual or group sort carried out in the United States, Japan, or elsewhere abroad. In some instances conferences relating more to problems or subjects of urgent importance to the field as a whole than to the research agenda of individual scholars are involved, in others collaborative research on a bi-national basis between Americans and Japanese. In every minor degree some of these costs can be

and are borne by the universities. The bulk of the funding has come, however, either directly or indirectly from foundations or the federal government. No alternative source is in sight. Both the foundations and the government provide such funds on a nationally competitive basis through programs operated by the Social Science Research Council, the American Council of Learned Societies, Guggenheim, the National Endowment for the Humanities, National Science Foundation, and Fulbright and Fulbright-Hays programs. Research support is also made available on a more selective and specific basis through foundation and National Defense Education Act grants to particular Japanese Area and Language Centers. In our opinion both sorts of support are useful and necessary.

6. Library Costs

In the Japanese field these involve acquisitions, staffing, training, upgrading and space. The specific problems involved are complex, technical, and difficult. So far all these basic costs have been borne largely by the institutions concerned with assists from both foundations and the government. It is hard to see where universities at least are going to find the funds to continue to bear this large a share of the cost. More assistance from either foundations or the government is desperately needed. Meanwhile several very promising developments with respect to shared and centralized cataloguing, the use of computers for bibliographic purposes, and more systematic cooperation with the National Diet Library in Tokyo and professional Japanese librarians need to be followed out.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Japan's World Position in 1967

<u>In Millions of \$</u>	<u>U.S.A.</u>	<u>West Germany</u>	<u>Japan</u>	<u>United Kingdom</u>	<u>India</u>	<u>U.S.S.R.</u>
G.N.P.	\$861,400	120,975	115,660	108,843	43,842	N.D.
Foreign Trade						
Imports	26,813	17,352	11,664	17,186	2,809	8,536
Exports	31,243	21,737	10,442	13,869	1,613	9,649
Trade with U.S.						
Imports from U.S.	--	1,706	4,451	1,960	955	60
Exports to U.S.	--	1,955	2,347	1,710	294	41
Travel abroad (in thousands)	9,649.4	6,621.3	476.7	4,289.0	179.6	1,755.2
Volume of Mail (in millions)						
Domestic	76,593	8,488	9,829	10,918	6,639	6,296
Foreign sent	627.4	492.4	86.2	581.3	90.5	(total do-
Foreign received	1,198:	376.7	97.1	477.4	162.5	mestic and foreign)
Employment in Insti- tutions of Higher Education	657,000 ^{1a}	10,994 ^a	66,738 ^{2b}	21,865 ^{3a}	84,079 ^{4c}	N.D.
Publications						
Books	58,877	29,524	24,595	29,564	10,617	74,081
DAILY newspapers	1,749	423	174 ^a	106	588	616
Translations	2,068 ^a	3,095 ^a	1,669 ^a	752 ^a	840 ^a	3,968 ^a

Notes

Unless otherwise specified, all figures are for 1967 and were obtained from the United Nations Statistical Yearbook for 1969.

¹Statistical Abstract of the United States, 1969.

²Japan Statistical Yearbook, 1968.

³Great Britain: Annual Abstract of Statistics, 1967.

⁴Statistical Abstract of the Indian Union, 1967.

^aFigures are for 1966.

^bFigures are for full-time employees; part-time employees numbered 34,393 in 1967 according to the Japan Statistical Yearbook, 1968.

^cFigures are for 1963-64.

APPENDIX 2a

Institutional Distribution of Japanese Specialists
 (Based on Roster of Scholars)

1-University of Alaska
 3-American University
 1-Amherst College
 2-University of Arizona
 3-Arizona State University
 1-Biola College
 1-Boston College
 1-Boston University
 1-Bowling Green State University
 1-Brandeis University
 3-Brigham Young University
 1-Brown University
 2-Bucknell University
 13-University of California at Berkeley
 1-University of California at Davis
 8-University of California at Los Angeles
 1-University of California at Riverside
 1-University of California at San Diego
 3-University of California at Santa Barbara
 2-California State College at Hayward
 2-California State College at Humboldt
 2-California State College at Los Angeles
 4-California State College at San Jose
 1-Canisius College
 1-Carleton College
 1-Carnegie-Mellon University
 1-Case Western Reserve University
 1-Central College (Iowa)
 9-University of Chicago
 2-City University of New York, Baruch School
 1-City University of New York at Brooklyn
 4-Claremont Colleges
 2-Colby College
 1-College of William & Mary
 1-College of Wooster
 5-University of Colorado
 1-Colorado State University
 18-Columbia University
 1-Connecticut College
 3-Cornell University
 1-Dartmouth College
 1-Duke University
 1-Earlham College
 1-Eastern Michigan University
 2-University of Florida
 1-Florida State University
 1-Geneva College

2-Georgetown University
 1-University of Georgia
 1-Georgia State University
 1-Gettysburg College
 1-Hamilton College
 16-Harvard University
 51-University of Hawaii
 5-University of Illinois
 1-Illinois State University
 6-Indiana University
 2-University of Iowa
 2-Iowa State University
 6-University of Kansas
 1-Kent State University
 1-University of Kentucky
 1-Knox College
 1-Lawrence College
 1-Loma Linda University
 2-Manhattanville College
 1-Marquette University
 2-University of Maryland
 3-University of Massachusetts
 1-University of Miami
 2-Miami University
 17-University of Michigan
 3-Michigan State University
 7-University of Minnesota
 1-University of Missouri
 1-Monmouth College
 1-University of New Mexico
 1-New School of Social Research
 4-New York University
 3-University of North Carolina
 1-Northeastern University
 1-Northeastern Illinois State University
 1-Northern Illinois University
 1-Northwest Nazarene College
 2-Northwestern University
 1-Oakland City College
 1-Occidental College
 1-Ohio University
 3-Ohio State University
 1-Oklahoma State University
 5-University of Oregon
 4-University of Pennsylvania
 4-University of Pittsburgh
 8-Princeton University
 1-Randolph-Macon College
 1-Rice University
 3-University of Rochester
 1-Rutgers--The State University
 1-Sacramento State College
 1-St. Michael's College

3-San Diego State College
 1-San Fernando Valley State College
 4-San Francisco State College
 2-Seton Hall University
 1-Smith College
 7-University of Southern California
 1-Southern Colorado State College
 10-Stanford University
 3-State University College at New Paltz
 1-State University of New York at Binghamton
 2-State University of New York at Buffalo
 1-State University of New York at Oswego
 1-State University of New York at Plattsburgh
 3-Syracuse University
 1-Temple University
 1-University of Tennessee
 5-University of Texas (Austin)
 1-Texas Christian University
 1-University of Toledo
 1-Towson State College
 1-Tufts University
 2-Union University
 1-University of Utah
 2-Vanderbilt University
 1-Virginia State University
 10-University of Washington
 1-Washington State University
 5-Washington University
 1-Wayne State University
 3-Wesleyan University
 2-Western Michigan University
 1-Williams College
 5-University of Wisconsin
 3-Wisconsin State University
 1-Wright State
 13-Yale University

Analysis

Total number of institutions	135
Institutions with 2 or more specialists	61
Institutions with 4 or more specialists	27
Institutions with 8 or more specialists	11

APPENDIX 2b

Distribution of Japanese Specialists by Discipline
 (Based on Roster of Scholars)

Anthropology	28
Art and Architecture	16
Economics	22
Education	5
Geography	8
History	110
Language and Linguistics	98
Literature	33
Music	1
Philosophy and Religion	15
Political Science	52
Psychology	5
Sociology	15
Other	<u>8</u>
Total	416

APPENDIX 2c

American Universities and Colleges with Undergraduate
Student Enrollments in Japanese Language Courses

TABLE I, FALL 1965*

<u>Colleges and Universities</u>	<u>Enroll- ments</u>	<u>Colleges and Universities</u>	<u>Enroll- ments</u>
Hawaii	1135	Iowa	21
Los Angeles City	200	Pasadena City	19
California (Los Angeles)	167	Michigan (Ann Arbor)	18
Washington (Seattle)	146	Princeton	17
California State (Los Angeles)	120	Harvard	16
California (Berkeley)	118	Illinois	16
Brigham Young	66	Kansas	16
San Jose State	65	Nebraska	15
Colorado	61	Pittsburgh	15
San Francisco State	60	Georgetown	14
Columbia	53	Wisconsin (Madison)	14
Indiana	48	American	11
Stanford	47	Kentucky	10
Oregon	40	Bennett	8
Southern California	39	Washington (St. Louis)	8
Monterey Peninsula	35	Rochester	7
Minnesota	32	Cornell	6
Utah	31	Massachusetts	6
Yale	27	Monmouth (Illinois)	6
East Los Angeles	26	Northwest Nazarene (Idaho)	6
Michigan State	26	Pennsylvania	6
Bucknell	25	Monterey Institute	5
Church School of Hawaii	25	Randolph Macon	4
Arizona	25	Kalamazoo	3
Manhattanville	23	State University of New York (Buffalo)	3
Maunaolu	23	New School of Social Research	2
Antioch	21	Claremont Graduate	1
		Pitzer (California)	1

Total number of enrollments - 2976

Total number of institutions - 55

*Compiled from Foreign Language Enrollments in Institutions of
Higher Education, Fall 1965, issued by The Modern Language
Association of America, September 1966.

TABLE II, FALL 1968*

Colleges and Universities	Enrollments	Colleges and Universities	Enrollments
Hawaii	982	Texas (El Paso)	24
Los Angeles City	212	Kansas	23
Washington (Seattle)	205	Hawaii Loa	23
California (Los Angeles)	186	Seton Hall	22
San Francisco State	121	Cornell	22
San Jose State	115	Manhattanville	21
California (Berkeley)	108	Monmouth (Illinois)	21
Brigham Young	78	Washington (St. Louis)	21
Ohio State	76	Pasadena City	19
Indiana	73	Princeton	17
Minnesota	72	Rochester	17
California (Santa Barbara)	69	American	16
Colorado	69	Earlham	16
Southern California	68	Alaska	13
Columbia	55	Yale	13
Stanford	52	Colby	13
Oregon	51	Wesleyan	12
Hawaii (Hilo)	49	Miami	12
Lewis & Clark	46	Georgia State	11
East Los Angeles	44	Mauna Olu	10
Utah	43	Alaska Methodist	9
Michigan (Ann Arbor)	43	Pacific	9
Chaminade	43	Scripps	8
Monterey Peninsula	40	State University of New York (Buffalo)	8
California (Davis)	37	Elmira	7
Michigan State	34	Antioch	7
Illinois	32	Massachusetts	7
Bucknell	32	Duke	6
Wisconsin (Madison)	32	Virginia Commonwealth	6
Arizona	30	Loma Linda	5
Arizona State	30	Iowa State	5
San Joaquin Delta	29	Randolph Macon	4
Georgetown	28	De Pauw	4
Chicago	27	Oblate	3
Iowa	27	Canisius	3
Bennett	25	Monterey Institute	2
Texas (Austin)	25	Kalamazoo	2

Total number of enrollments - 3757

Total number of institutions - 75

*Compiled from Foreign Language Enrollments in Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1965, issued by The Modern Language Association of America, September 1966.

TABLE II, continued

Average contact hours per week for those institutions reporting contact hours - 4.2 hours.

Colleges known or thought to teach Japanese but not reporting:

Harvard University
University of Florida
Florida State University
Carleton College
University of Maryland
State University of New York (New Paltz)
Church College of Hawaii
Pittsburgh University
University of Kentucky
Pitzer College
Northwest Nazarene College
University of Nebraska

Total - 12

APPENDIX 2d

American Universities with Graduate Student
Enrollments in Japanese Language Courses

TABLE I, FALL 1965*

<u>University</u>	<u>Enrollments</u>
Columbia	131
Harvard	54
Indiana	50
Hawaii	38
Michigan	35
Chicago	31
Seton Hall	26
Georgetown	25
Stanford	24
Arizona	17
Minnesota	15
Yale	14
Washington (Seattle)	11
Princeton	8
Washington (St. Louis)	6
California (Berkeley)	5
Illinois	5
Massachusetts	5
Southern California	5
California (Los Angeles)	4
Iowa	4
Kansas	4
Pennsylvania	4

Total number of enrollments - 521

Total number of institutions - 23

*Compiled from Foreign Language Registrations and Student Contact Hours in Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1968 and Summer 1969, issued by The Modern Language Association of America, November, 1969, pp. 31-46.

TABLE II, FALL 1968*

<u>University</u>	<u>Enrollments</u>
Hawaii	189
Columbia	99
Michigan	66
Stanford	43
Wisconsin	24
California (Berkeley)	23
Chicago	23
Seton Hall	20
Washington (Seattle)	17
Indiana	13
Georgetown	11
Michigan State	11
Arizona	10
California (Los Angeles)	6
Minnesota	6
Ohio State	3
Kansas	1

Total number of enrollments - 565

Total number of institutions - 18

Not reporting: Several including Harvard, Yale,
and Pittsburgh

* Compiled from Foreign Language Registrations and Student Contact Hours in Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1968 and Summer 1969, issued by The Modern Language Association of America, November, 1969, pp. 31-46.

APPENDIX 2e

Enrollments in Japanese Language Courses Showing
Comparisons with Other Languages

I. REGISTRATIONS IN FIVE LEADING MODERN LANGUAGES*

<u>Year</u>	<u>Total</u>	<u>Undergraduate</u>	<u>Graduate</u>
1960	595,324	578,988 (51,007)	16,336
1963	781,920	752,868 (75,088)	29,052
1965	952,496	919,059 (103,685)	33,437
1968	1,040,284	1,005,778 (126,779)	34,506

Includes 4-year colleges and junior colleges. Figures in parentheses are junior college enrollments.

II. BREAKDOWN OF UNDERGRADUATE ENROLLMENTS IN FIVE LEADING LANGUAGES (1960)

French	205,686
Spanish	154,327
German	133,130
Russian	28,342
Italian	10,459

III. REGISTRATIONS IN OTHER LANGUAGES WITH NATIONAL TOTALS OF 100 OR MORE REGISTRATIONS*

	<u>1960</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1968</u>
Arabic	541	835	930	1,100
Chinese	1,844	2,444	3,359	5,061
Czech	120	176	158	182
Dutch	130	172	143	158
Greek (Modern)	139	440	217	146
Hebrew	3,834	5,538	8,093	10,169
Hindi	106	173	145	349
Japanese	1,746	2,813	3,443	4,324
Norwegian	722	942	803	1,103
Polish	539	708	607	656
Portuguese	1,033	2,051	3,034	4,048
Serbo-Croatian	149	131	134	209
Swedish	622	705	682	1,101

*Compiled from Foreign Language Registrations and Student Contact Hours in Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1968 and Summer 1969, issued by The Modern Language Association of America, November, 1969, pp. 31-46.

ANALYSIS

In comparison with French enrollments in 1968 (388,096), Japanese registrations are 1.1%.

The average intensity of language training in Japanese does not differ substantially from that in French, though it takes six times as long to learn Japanese as it does French.

While understandable, the geographic distribution of Japanese language teaching is highly concentrated in two states: Hawaii (1296 reported registrations, 30.0% of the total) and California (1224 reported registrations, 28.3% of the total). The next highest enrollments are reported in New York State, with 257 or 5.9% of the total. No registrations are reported in 23 states (46%), most of which are in the South or Northwest Mountain area.

APPENDIX 2f

Enrollments at the Inter-University Center for
Japanese Language Studies in Tokyo

1963-1969

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Graduate</u>	<u>Undergraduate</u>
Barnard	2	1
Brigham Young		1
U.B.C.		2
Bryn Mawr		1
Chicago	3	1
Claremont	1	
Columbia	14	
Cornell	1	1
Dartmouth		1
Harvard	11	1
Hawaii	1	
Indiana	1	1
Kansas	2	
London, U. of	1	1
Manhattanville		1
Michigan	20	2
Minnesota		1
Oregon		2
Oxford, U. of	3	
Princeton	5	8
Stanford*	43	29
Texas	1	1
U.C. Berkeley	9	2
U.C.L.A.	2	
U.S.C.	2	
Vermont		1
Washington	6	4
Yale	10	
TOTALS	138	62

*The heavy enrollment for Stanford was primarily during the first two years when the IUC was a Stanford center.

APPENDIX 2g

Check List of U.S. Colleges and Universities
Supporting Area Studies Relating
to Japan as of 1962

(Compiled in 1963 for the U.S.-Japan Cultural Conference)

1. An attempt is made here to show, in panoramic view, the state of expansion of Japanese area studies in U.S. colleges. Two devices, categories and staff counts, are used here to provide clearer perception of the richness or concentration of each program than could be conveyed by a mere list of college names. Institutions offering single courses or employing fewer than four specialists are not listed. Neither device, of course, is fully revealing or accurate, nor is the list itself more than a first-draft roster. Its chief sources are W. Morehouse (ed.), American Institutions and Organizations Interested in Asia, supplemented by data from the Association for Asian Studies Newsletter for 1962-63.

2. List A, aids to interpretation:

a. Categories: The most fully developed Japanese studies programs appear in column one (left side). Institutions with minor or embryo programs are most apt to appear only in column three (right side); yet certain major institutions appear there also to indicate that they are well staffed for several or all regions of Asia.

b. Numerals: Although figures may mislead, staff counts are given immediately following the college name when available in the sources used. The figure used is the one that refers as directly as possible to Japanese studies; e.g., for Colorado, instead of the total staff concerned, only the five Far Eastern specialists are listed.

c. Summer Sessions (SS): The SS symbol following a name indicates that this college, in addition to its regular program, also offered a multidepartmental program on Asia or the Far East in the summer session of 1962-63; not a few do so every summer. Combined with List B, the SS institutions complete the roster of Asian and Far Eastern summer session programs.

LIST A

<u>Japan</u>	<u>Far East (including Southeast Asia)</u>	<u>Asia</u>
	Amherst	
	American, 7	American
	Arizona, 5	Antioch
	Brooklyn SS	Brigham Young
Calif. (Berkeley) 7	California SS	California
California (L.A.)	Calif. (L.A.), 30	California (L.A.)
	Chicago, 17	
		Claremont, 10
	Colorado, 5 SS	Colgate, 5
Columbia, 11	Columbia SS	Colorado
	Cornell, 12	Columbia
	Dartmouth	
	Denison	
	Earlham	
		Florida SS
	Georgia	Florida State, 8
Harvard	Harvard, 17*	
	Haverford group	Harvard
Hawaii	Hawaii SS	
		Hawaii, 35
		Heidelberg
Indiana	Indiana SS	Johns Hopkins
	Illinois SS	Indiana, 22
	Iowa, 7	
	Kansas, 6 SS	
		Los Angeles State SS
		Marquette, 10
Michigan, 15	Michigan SS	Massachusetts, 12
	Michigan State SS	Michigan
	Minnesota SS	
	Nebraska, 4	Minnesota, 14
		NYSU, Oneonta, 8
		N. Carolina, 5 SS
		Ohio State
		Oklahoma, 7 SS
Oregon	Oregon, 9 SS	
	Pennsylvania, 15 SS	Pennsylvania
	Pittsburgh	
Princeton	Princeton, 18	Princeton
		Rochester, 6 SS

*28 or more research staff not counted.

List A: continued

<u>Japan</u>	<u>Far East (including Southeast Asia)</u>	<u>Asia</u>
	Rutgers, 7 SS San Fran. State, 5	St. John's (NY), 3 SS Seton Hall, 10 South Carolina, 5 Southern California Southern Ill., 7 SS Stanford Sweet Briar group, 6 Syracuse, 4 SS Texas, 7 SS Utah, 7 SS Virginia, 6 SS Washington
Southern California	Southern Cal., 13 SS	
Stanford	Stanford, 12 SS	
Washington(Seattle)	Washington, 22 SS Washington (St. Louis)	William & Mary Williams Winston-Salem group Wisconsin, 17 Yale
Yale	Yale (16 + 55) SS	

LIST B

Colleges providing a summer session program on Asia or the Far East, but not offering such a multidepartmental program during the academic year.

Boston
Bucknell
Delaware
Duke
Iowa State
Kent State
Long Island
NYSU, Genesco
NYSU, New Paltz
NYSU, Plattsburgh
Northern Illinois
Northwestern
Reed College
Trinity College
Wake Forest
Waukegan
Wesleyan (Conn.)
Western Michigan

APPENDIX 2h

List of NDEA Language and Area Centers Which Offer
Work in East Asian Studies*

University of Arizona
Brown University
Bucknell University
University of California (Berkeley)
University of Chicago
University of Colorado
Columbia University
Cornell University
Dartmouth College (1)
Earlham College
Harvard University
University of Hawaii
University of Illinois
University of Iowa
University of Kansas
Manhattanville College
University of Michigan
Michigan State University (Oakland) (1)
Oberlin College (1)
University of Pittsburgh
Princeton University
University of Rochester
University of Southern California
University of Texas
University of Washington
Yale University
Stanford University
Washington University

Total: 28

(1) Institutions at which Japanese is not taught.

*From Awards for Modern Foreign Language and Area Study:
1969-70. Office of Education, 1969.

APPENDIX 21

I. Listing by Institutions of 1969-70 Quotas
for Graduate Fellowships (NDFL) in
East Asian Studies*

Harvard	53
Columbia	52
Michigan	31
Washington	27
California (Berkeley)	24
Chicago	20
Yale	20
Stanford	15
Cornell	7
Indiana	6
Wisconsin	6
Kansas	4
Pennsylvania	4
Arizona	3
George Washington	3
Illinois	3
Minnesota	3
UCLA	3
USC	3
Washington University	3
Iowa	2
Pittsburgh	2
Texas	2
Brown	1
California (Davis)	1
Georgetown	1
Total	299

II. Listing of Intensive Summer Study Grant Quotas
in Japanese and Chinese, 1969

<u>Institution</u>	<u>Graduate</u>	<u>Undergraduate</u>
Arizona	2	28
Columbia	35	50
Indiana	68	10
Stanford	24	35

*Compiled from Awards for Modern Foreign Language and Area Study, 1969-70. Office of Education, 1969.

APPENDIX 2J

Distribution of Awarding Institutions and Discipline
of Ph.D.'s in the Japanese Field

Note: These tables are based on information in returned questionnaires plus that in Japan and Korea: An Annotated Bibliography of Doctoral Dissertations in Western Languages, 1877-1969 by Frank Shulman.

TABLE I

AWARDING INSTITUTIONS

American University	3	Massachusetts Institute	
Brown University	1	of Technology	4
University of California,		University of Michigan	47
Berkeley	37	Michigan State University	2
University of California,		University of Minnesota	3
Los Angeles	4	University of Nebraska	1
University of Chicago	8	Northwestern University	3
Claremont Graduate School	4	New York University	6
University of Colorado	1	University of Oregon	2
Columbia University	46	University of the Pacific	1
Cornell University	3	Univ. of Pennsylvania	8
Duke University	2	University of Pittsburgh	1
Tufts University	2	Princeton University	4
Fordham University	1	Radcliffe College	3
Florida State University	1	Stanford University	19
Georgetown University	2	University of Southern	
George Washington Univ.	1	California	4
Harvard University	54	Syracuse University	2
Illinois University	4	University of Texas	2
Indiana University	8	University of Utah	2
Johns Hopkins University	4	University of Washington	17
University of Kansas	1	Washington State Univ.	1
University of Maryland	1	University of Wisconsin	11
		Yale University	15

Analysis

Total number of Ph.D.'s: 348
 Total number of Ph.D.'s in progress reported: 107
 Total number of institutions awarding Ph.D.'s: 43
 Number of institutions awarding 5 or more: 12

TABLE II

DISTRIBUTION BY DISCIPLINE

(figures in parentheses are for Ph.D.'s in progress)

Anthropology	19 (6)
Art and Architecture	10 (5)
Economics	38 (3)
Education	4
Geography	5 (1)
History	112 (47)
Language and Linguistics	25 (3)
Literature	34 (22)
Music	3
Philosophy and Religion	17 (5)
Political Science	54 (15)
Psychology	1
Sociology	16 (1)
Total	348 (107)

APPENDIX 2k

American Universities with Library Holdings of
Japanese Language Materials of More
Than 10,000 Volumes in 1968*

	<u>Dec., 1968</u>	<u>June, 1965</u>
California (Berkeley)	126,000	116,086
Harvard	108,669	95,482
Nichigar. (Ann Arbor)	97,381	80,596
Columbia	93,774	76,000
Hawaii	87,738	68,312
Maryland	79,061	70,000
Yale	54,226	40,261
California (Los Angeles)	50,000	37,449
Stanford (Hoover)	44,350	34,701
Chicago	41,633	25,507
Princeton	28,713	20,110
Washington (St. Louis)	20,000	6,000
Illinois	16,000	
Cornell	14,972	6,318
Arizona	13,278	7,669
Northwestern	13,163	10,000
Texas	12,690	9,750
Claremont	11,200	11,000
Kansas	10,975	6,170
Indiana	10,107	6,437

*Compiled from Newsletter of the Association for Asian Studies, Committee on Library Resources on the Far East, No. 16, October 15, 1966, and No. 29, May 15, 1969.

APPENDIX 2*l*List of Colleges and Universities
by Category of Program

UNDERGRADUATE AREA PROGRAM (61)

University of Arizona
Arizona State University
Brigham Young University
Bucknell University
University of California, Berkeley
University of California, Los Angeles
University of California, Santa Barbara
California State University, Hayward
University of Chicago
Claremont Colleges
University of Colorado
Columbia University
Cornell University
Earlham College
University of Florida
Georgetown University
Harvard University
University of Hawaii
Humboldt State College
University of Illinois
Indiana University
University of Iowa
Iowa State University
University of Kansas
University of Kentucky
University of Maryland
Manhattanville College
University of Massachusetts
Miami University (Ohio)
University of Michigan
University of Minnesota
University of New Mexico
New York University
State University of New York, Buffalo
State University of New York, New Paltz
University of North Carolina
Northwestern University
Ohio State University
University of Oregon
University of Pennsylvania
University of Pittsburgh
Princeton University
University of Rochester
San Diego State College
San Francisco State College
Michigan State University

San Jose State College
 Seton Hall University
 University of Southern California
 Stanford University
 Syracuse University
 University of Texas
 Union University
 Vanderbilt University
 Washington University
 University of Washington
 Wesleyan University
 University of Wisconsin
 Wisconsin State University
 Yale University

LIMITED GRADUATE PROGRAM (25)

University of Arizona
 Brigham Young University
 Bucknell University
 Claremont Graduate School
 University of Colorado
 Cornell University
 Duke University
 University of Florida
 University of Illinois
 Indiana University
 University of Iowa
 University of Kansas
 University of Maryland

University of Minnesota
 Northwestern University
 Ohio State University
 University of Oregon
 University of Pennsylvania
 University of Pittsburgh
 University of Rochester
 Seton Hall University
 University of Southern
 California
 University of Texas
 Washington University
 University of Wisconsin

COMPLETE GRADUATE PROGRAM (11)

University of California (Berkeley)
 University of California (Los Angeles)
 Chicago University
 Columbia University
 Harvard University
 University of Hawaii
 University of Michigan
 Princeton University
 Stanford University
 University of Washington
 Yale University

APPENDIX 3

Summary of Results of Questionnaires Sent to Individuals
in the Field of Japanese Studies

I. INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes the results of the questionnaires sent to individuals in the Japanese field by the Joint Committee on Japanese Studies. A total of 597 questionnaire forms were sent out in May of 1969. The list of scholars to whom forms were sent was arrived at from several lists: the membership list of the Association for Asian Studies, a roster of area specialists compiled by Richard Lambert for his survey of area studies, the membership list of the Association of Teachers of Japanese, various lists compiled for the disciplinary survey meetings sponsored by the Joint Committee, and lists of completed Ph.D. dissertations. Although every effort was made to achieve as complete a coverage as possible, we are well aware that errors both of inclusion and exclusion have been made. Nonetheless we feel that the 332 replies which had been received at the time of tabulation comprise a rather considerable return from the membership of the field and that a summary of these replies can be taken as statistically representative of the field as a whole.

For the preparation of this summary, the Joint Committee wishes to thank William Bogaty of Yale University who did the arduous work of reducing questionnaire answers to statistically usable form and who oversaw the computer analysis. The resulting report is based on two types of summaries, since the original questionnaires contained both closed- and open-ended questions. First, where the written responses presented the basis for statistical tabulation, the answers were card-punched for computer analysis. The results of this analysis comprise the foundation of our report and are the source of its broad generalizations. Written responses to open-ended questions could not be handled statistically but instead have been used to illustrate the great range of viewpoints within the field on certain basic issues. Some respondents sent long letters, reports, and other material along with, or in lieu of, questionnaire answers; while these could not be coded for computer analysis, their ideas are incorporated in the summary statements below, and, of course, in the Joint Committee's general report.

There are obvious statistical weaknesses in the procedures used for this report, and these we wish to make explicit. First, there are the built-in inadequacies of conclusions based on an incomplete census on indeterminate populations. (The difficulties of defining the total "field" of Japanese studies is explained above in Appendix 2a.) Second, the small

size of the sample created definite analytical problems when responses were examined in terms of age, discipline, etc. Thirdly, because of the incompleteness of the census, it has been necessary to express all figures in terms of percentages, rather than totals. It should be explained that all percentages in this report, unless noted otherwise, represent fractions based on totals of "significant" responses, rather than those based on raw totals. That is, answers of "null," generally because the respondent left the question blank, have been excluded in preparing the percentages.

II. SUMMARY OF RESULTS

A. Biographical Information

1. Age and Academic Rank

The following table shows the respondents classified by age. As can be seen, a rather surprising 49% were forty or younger.

20-30	11%
31-40	38%
41-50	32%
51-60	15%
61+	4%

All but an insignificant number of those who responded (98%) were students or faculty members, or were connected with the academic world in some manner:

Graduate Student (non-teaching)	6%
Lecturer/Instructor (teaching without PhD)	13%
Assistant Professor	18%
Associate Professor	18%
Professor	37%
Librarian/Curator, etc.	1%
Other Academic (e.g., Research Associate)	4%

The graduate students, as might be expected, were distributed in the two youngest age groups. Full professors were generally over forty, although 11% appeared in the 31-40 group. Full tables appear below:

BY RANK:

	20-30	31-40	41-50	51-60	61+	Total
Graduate Student	55%	45%	0%	0%	0%	100%
Lecturer/Inst.	23%	43%	14%	5%	5%	100%
Asst. Professor	18%	67%	10%	5%	0%	100%
Assoc. Professor	0%	53%	40%	7%	0%	100%
Professor	0%	11%	50%	33%	6%	100%

BY AGE:

	Grad. Student	Lect./ Inst.	Asst. Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Prof.	Total
20-30	34%	32%	34%	0%	0%	100%
31-40	7%	20%	34%	26%	14%	101%
41-50	0%	6%	6%	24%	63%	99%
51-60	0%	4%	6%	8%	81%	99%
61+	0%	20%	0%	0%	80%	100%

What appears to be the relative youth in terms of academic rank of individuals in the Japan field is confirmed by comparing their ranks and ages with the averages for all teaching faculty in universities and four-year colleges in the United States. The statistics for the aggregate of faculty shown below are taken from a report from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare in 1963 (unfortunately, the latest published figures on the subject).

	<u>Japanese Studies</u>		<u>Aggregate United States</u>
20-30	11%	20-29	7%
31-40	38%	30-39	33%
41-50	32%	40-49	30%
51-60	15%	50-59	20%
61 & older	4%	60 & older	10%
	<u>100%</u>		<u>100%</u>
Lecturer/Instructor	15%		16%
Assistant Professor	22%		29%
Associate Professor	21%		24%
Professor	42%		27%
	<u>100%</u>	Other*	4%
			<u>100%</u>

(*The category "Other," amounting to 4% in the JCJS survey, was excluded in preparing percentages of the Japanese Studies figures. That category has been included in the figures for the Aggregate United States. This certainly shifts the results somewhat, but not enough to upset the general pattern.)

Another interesting way to look at the figures on rank is in terms of distribution by discipline:

	Grad. Stud.	Lect./ Inst.	Asst. Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Prof.	Total
Anthropology	7%	7%	20%	20%	47%	101%
Art	7%	14%	14%	7%	57%	99%
Economics	0%	0%	0%	13%	85%	100%
History	12%	12%	19%	26%	31%	100%
Language/Lit.	5%	33%	26%	15%	21%	100%
Law	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%	100%
Linguistics	0%	0%	50%	20%	30%	100%
Political Sci.	3%	10%	10%	24%	52%	99%
Religion	0%	17%	50%	17%	17%	101%
Sociology	7%	0%	21%	14%	57%	99%
Percent of Total:	7%	14%	20%	20%	37%	100%

This table illustrates, for example, the special place occupied by language teachers. Despite the unhappiness literature specialists express over being used as language trainers for other disciplines (the statement, "I object to language being used as a tool," is typical), it is clear that the discipline has a large percentage of instructors serving merely as teachers of language.

It is interesting that those in the social sciences appear to achieve higher ranks at an earlier age than those in the humanities. This may reflect the comparative newness of these specialties and the scarcity of personnel in them.

2. Departmental Affiliation and Disciplinary Specialization

Respondents classified themselves by discipline as follows:

Anthropology	10%
Art	5%
Economics	4%
History	33%
Language/Lit.	19%
Political Science	10%
Sociology	4%

All other categories, which, besides "null" and "other," included geography, law, linguistics, and religion, had fewer than 47% each. As can be seen, the two humanities categories of History and Language/Literature comprise over half of the

sample, and the replies from this group generally set the tone for the survey as a whole. This is notable because of the area-discipline controversy apparent in many of the respondents' answers. At several points in our analysis it is made apparent that the social scientists are seen as deviating from the "norm" for area studies set by those who appear most committed to it: historians and scholars of literature.

3. Self-Identification as Japan Specialists

Asked to identify themselves primarily as members of a discipline or as area specialists, 13% of those who responded did not consider themselves Japanese area specialists. When asked if Japan was their sole area of specialization only 37% responded affirmatively. The remainder listed China or other Asian areas as subjects of secondary interest. Among the 87% of the sample which classified themselves as area specialists, the breakdown by discipline appears below:

<u>Discipline</u>	<u>Percentage Who Consider Themselves Japanese Area Specialists</u>
Anthropology	85%
Art	63%
Economics	79%
History	93%
Language/Literature	97%
Law	43%
Linguistics	82%
Political Science	94%
Religion	100%
Sociology	71%
Percentage of Aggregate	87%

This breakdown is interesting in a number of respects. First is the high percentage of scholars in History and Language/Literature who consider themselves Japanese area specialists. Second is the extraordinary percentage of Political Scientists who consider themselves specialists, especially in comparison with such disciplines as Anthropology, Economics, and Sociology. Other evidence also indicates that political scientists, more than other social scientists, began studying and are studying Japan as a unique area and are treating it as an object of description, rather than simply as a reservoir for data in a comparative context.

4. Origin of Interest in the Japan Field

About 14% entered the field of Japanese studies in America because they were native Japanese. Others came into the field through a variety of other reasons, and these are tabulated below:

Lifetime interest	6%
U.S. Armed Forces--World War II or Occupation	16%
U.S. Armed Forces--Korean War era	4%
U.S. Armed Forces--post-Korean	9%
Due to World War II (other than Armed Forces)	6%
Work/Teaching in Japan	4%
Interest in Japan for comparative study	13%
Stimulated by courses/professors	11%
Other	10%

One point that immediately emerges from these figures is the overwhelming role of the American military presence in East Asia as a stimulant to American interest in Japan. Over one-third of the respondents became interested in Japan through World War II or because of service in the armed forces after the war:

Armed Forces--World War II, Occupation	16%
Armed Forces--Korean War era	4%
Armed Forces--post-Korean War era	9%
Due to World War II	6%
	35%

Of course, age groups were affected differently by the cycle of international events: 49% of those 41-50 and 38% of those 51-60 were influenced by American military involvement in East Asia, while 30% of those 31-40 and only 9% of those under 30 were so influenced.

The younger age groups became interested in Japan in fashions similar to the oldest age group: largely by chance. A fifth of those between 21-30 and a quarter of those over 61 turned to Japanese studies because they had worked or taught in Japan. Of the younger group 24%, and of the older group 25%, were stimulated by professors or college courses. This figure for either group is more than the combined percentages of the other groups. It is also interesting that the catch-all "other" category comprised 27% of the 20-30 age group. The only other group which approaches this figure is the oldest one, of which 17% became interested because of "other" reasons.

It is clear, then, that students entering the field now have different concerns than their elders. Only rarely does one read sentences recalling such reasons as: "I entered the Army in December 1942...My wartime training--20 straight months of language study--and field experience determined me to go into the field," or "My parents had two sons. About 1938 my father announced that there would one day be a war

with Japan and then with Russia and that we were to study those languages. I was oldest." Young students today seem to be entering the field for rather idealistic and academic reasons, certainly for reasons other than the desire for making money. They seem less interested in descriptive exercises and more interested in theoretical work. Their concern with Japan has been better cultivated, and they have been better trained and informed.

A breakdown of the origin of interest in Japan by discipline reveals a number of interesting results. Quite significant is the following list of disciplines in which a large percentage entered the Japan field because of the advantages it offered for comparative work:

Anthropology	27%
Art	27%
Linguistics	24%
Sociology	40%
Percentage of Aggregate	13%

Notably absent from this list are Economics and Political Science. Only an average number of economists stated that they entered the field because of its advantages for comparative work, and none of the political scientists cited this reason.

5. Point in Career when Respondent Became Interested in Japanese Studies

The following table is presented without comment:

16%	had a lifetime interest
33%	before receipt of their undergraduate degree
25%	before receipt of their master degrees
15%	before receipt of their highest degree
8%	after receipt of their highest degrees

The age breakdown for the above data shows that recent entrants into the field have come in at an earlier age and hence are receiving a longer period of training:

<u>Age</u>	<u>Percentage Who Became Interested in Japan Before Receipt of AB</u>
20-30	63%
31-40	30%
41-50	36%
51-60	16%
61+	23%

6. Highest Degree

88% of the respondents are PhD's. Many of those who hold MA's (about 9% of the total) are native Japanese language instructors.

7. Field of Highest Degree

The figures for this category are nearly identical with those for the department/discipline response (A.2 above) with only a few differences. The greatest discrepancies appear in Language/Literature and Linguistics:

	<u>Department of Affiliation</u>	<u>Field of Highest Degree</u>
Language/Literature	19.3%	13.8%
Linguistics	3.4%	6.4%

These figures seem to indicate that a larger number of people are teaching the Japanese language than have been trained for it, and that some of those trained in linguistics are not now active in Linguistics departments.

8. Institutions Which Granted PhD's

A small number of large institutions have a virtual monopoly on PhD's granted so far to scholars in the Japan field. The three top institutions granted almost 46% of all PhD's, the top five granted 62%, and the top eight, three-quarters:

Harvard	19%	
Columbia	14%	
Michigan	<u>13%</u>	46%
California, Berkeley	9%	
Chicago	<u>7%</u>	62%
Stanford	5%	
Yale	4%	
U. Washington, Seattle	<u>4%</u>	75%

9. College/University Where Now Teaching

Concentrations of scholars occur at those institutions granting large numbers of PhD's, as would be expected. It is understandable that the number of Japanese specialists at any one institution is not large, however. The University of

Hawaii, for example, has the greatest number of scholars in the field for any one university, but has only 7.5% of the total roster. Of the 41 institutions to which at least two questionnaires were sent, 23 had fewer than four specialists apiece. Information on the distribution of scholars is more accurately revealed in the analysis of the information obtained from the roster of scholars listed above (Appendix 2c).

10. Association Memberships and Attendance at Meetings

79% of the respondents belong to the Association for Asian Studies.

81% belong to their disciplinary organizations.

44% attend the meetings of the AAS more often than those of their disciplinary groups.

17% attend the meetings of the AAS and their disciplinary meetings with equal frequency.

55% of those who belong both to the AAS and their disciplinary groups attend the AAS meetings more frequently than those of their disciplinary groups.

B. Languages Read/Spoken

The vast majority of the respondents read and speak Japanese, at least 95% in both cases.

About 40% of the respondents read Chinese. Only 22% speak Chinese.

Other languages are listed below:

	<u>Read</u>	<u>Speak</u>
French	78%	49%
German	46%	33%
Other Asian	10.5%	
Other European	37%	

C. Japanese Language Training

Some 20% of the respondents were native speakers or had learned Japanese from childhood. These respondents were excluded in consideration from the following analysis. The remainder of the respondents' answers to questions of the type, length, and effectiveness of Japanese language training are summarized in the three tables below. Throughout this section the term year signifies the nine-month academic year.

1. Years of Training in Japan and the United States,
and Adequacy of Training by Age

Age	In Japan			In the United States		% who thought training was relatively adequate
	more than 0 yrs.	more than 2 yrs.	more than 0 yrs.	more than 3 yrs.	more than 5 yrs.	
20-30	76%	30%	94%	63%	23%	77%
31-40	69%	27%	87%	55%	17%	67%
41-50	33%	18%	85%	51%	20%	75%
51-60	41%	19%	77%	30%	7%	48%
61+	60%	50%	37%	12%	13%	63%
Percentage of Aggregate	55%	25%	85%	50%	17%	69%

2. Years of Training in Japan and the United States,
and Adequacy of Training by Discipline

Discipline	In Japan			In the United States		% who thought training was relatively adequate
	more than 0 yrs.	more than 2 yrs.	more than 0 yrs.	more than 3 yrs.	more than 5 yrs.	
Anthropology	52%	23%	77%	23%	4%	39%
Art	45%	18%	75%	33%	17%	36%
Economics	50%	20%	73%	9%	0%	55%
History	58%	29%	91%	61%	21%	69%
Language/Literature	53%	17%	81%	75%	32%	83%
Law	17%	0%	50%	17%	0%	0%
Linguistics	67%	33%	83%	50%	33%	100%
Political Science	67%	27%	88%	42%	19%	92%
Religion	40%	40%	100%	75%	25%	100%
Sociology	67%	33%	62%	25%	13%	40%
Percentage of Aggregate	55%	25%	85%	50%	17%	69%

3. Respondents Receiving Formal Training in Japanese as Un-
dergraduates, as Grad Students, in the U.S. Armed Forces,
and Adequacy of Japanese Language Training by Age

Age	Formal Training Before AB	Formal Training as Grad. Students	Training in U.S. Armed Forces	Relatively Adequate Language Training
20-30	41%	88%	6%	77%
31-40	11%	80%	1%	67%
41-50	31%	56%	57%	75%
51-60	13%	46%	53%	48%
61+	9%	36%	8%	63%
Percentage of Aggregate	22%	137 67%	28%	69%

4. Adequacy of Respondents' Japanese Language Training

The figures for the self-evaluated adequacy of the respondents' Japanese language training, which appear in part in the tables above, are based on a question which was not altogether clear in meaning. Most respondents answered the question in terms of their ability to cope with Japanese materials professionally, but some responded in terms of the language teachers' ability to teach Japanese. In any case, 38% thought that their training was quite adequate, 31% thought their training was less than quite adequate, 21% thought their training was better than inadequate, and 10% thought that their training was quite inadequate.

With almost three-fifths of the respondents feeling that their training was relatively adequate, the contrast of this condition with the percentage of students within disciplines who are rated proficient in terms of Japanese language preparation by their teachers is rather striking. The averages of the number of graduate students who become proficient in Japanese within a discipline as evaluated by their teachers, for example, is perhaps a half of the percentage of respondents who evaluated their language training was adequate. This discrepancy obviously stems from the difference between the definitions of adequacy and proficiency among scholars in Japanese Studies. But judging from any objective analysis of what it takes to gain proficiency in reading and speaking Japanese, the median number of years which scholars admit to have studied Japanese in the United States (more than 3 years and less than 5) seems rather insufficient, for even a meager professional working knowledge of the language. Judging from the less quantifiable responses in the questionnaires, it would appear therefore that a large number (although not a majority) do not feel competent in dealing with technical materials in Japanese.

5. Language Training by Age Group

Ages 20-30. Training in the Japanese language has apparently become a longer and more rewarding process. The youngest age group, 20-30, has the highest percentage of people who studied in Japan than any other age group, the highest percentage of those who have studied in this country, and despite its youth--the highest percentage of those who have studied over five years in the United States.

Over 41% of the 20-30 group received formal training in Japanese before the receipt of their undergraduate degrees (63% became interested in specializing in Japan before receipt of the AB), a figure made more remarkable in comparison with other groups since many in, say, the 41-50 group received training prior to their AB degrees during World War II.

Ages 41-50. This group is highly confident of the

adequacy of its training in the Japanese language; almost as confident as the previous group. This is anomalous, at least by the standards of length of time in study. The percentage of those who have studied in Japan is substantially lower than the aggregate percentage. The percentage for years studied in the United States is about average. The crucial factors are, therefore, that 57% of this age group received training in the armed forces (presumably during or around World War II), that many received training before the receipt of their undergraduate degrees (31%), and that, compared with the total sample, a rather large number received training both before and after receipt of their first degrees. Finally, it is notable that a fairly high percentage became interested in specializing in Japan before their AB's (only the ages 20-30 group had a higher percentage). Only 3% became interested after receipt of their highest degrees.

Ages 31-40. The significance of the above generalizations are confirmed by exploring the 31-40 age group. Those in this group who were trained in the armed forces hardly exist. A comparatively small percentage received any training as undergraduates, but fully 80% received training in Japanese as graduate students. The table of years studied shows that the length of training of this group was above average (in fact, second only to the 20-30 group). What was missing from the training of this group, apparently, was an early commitment to learning the language, and an opportunity for beginning training in an intensive atmosphere. As a result a significantly smaller portion of this group felt that its training was adequate.

Ages 51-60. The observations made above are further confirmed with this group. To be sure 53% of this group "benefitted" from World War II training in Japanese. Nevertheless less than half felt that their training was relatively adequate. This can be accounted for by consideration of factors such as age when training was begun, point in career when interest in Japanese studies began, and length of training in Japan and in the United States. In other words, this age group began study of Japanese relatively late. Only 16% became interested in specializing in the Japan field before receipt of their undergraduate degrees (the average is 33%) and 29% became interested in specializing after receipt of the highest degree (the highest for any age group--the average is 8%). Only 37% of this group studied Japanese at all in the United States.

Age 61 and older. The oldest group underwent a pattern of language training quite distinct from the others. First, only 37% studied Japanese formally in the United States as undergraduates or graduate students, but a relatively large portion of these studied for over five years. A similar pattern prevails in the figures for those who studied in Japan: 60% studied in Japan (5% more than the average), but half of

these studied for more than two years there, by far the largest figure in that category. In general, those in the oldest groups became interested in Japan relatively later in life than other groups, but if they studied Japanese at all they studied longer than those in other groups.

6. Language Training Examined by Discipline

The scholars in History and in Language/Literature have had the longest training in general in the Japanese language, as might be expected. It is interesting in this regard, however, that those in Language/Literature had had less training in Japan than average. Specialists in Language/Literature apparently learned their trade by long years of study in the United States: 75% have spent more than three years of study in the United States (the average is 50%), and over two-fifths of those have spent more than five years. The small sample of specialists on Religion shows a similar pattern: they tend to study longer than other disciplines, and study mostly in the United States.

The social scientists, with the exception of the political scientists, have studied fewer years than those in the humanities, at least in the United States. First, a very high 67% of the sociologists and political scientists have studied Japanese in Japan, and generally for a fairly long time. About an average percentage of anthropologists have studied in Japan. Substantially fewer than an average number of anthropologists and sociologists have studied in the United States; those who have studied here generally have not studied very long. The political scientists, on the other hand, generally have a superior record in years of training in Japanese, particularly years in Japan. This phenomenon might be explained by again suggesting the general bent of political scientists who specialize on Japan--they have tended toward the area rather than toward the comparative or theoretical approach.

Three disciplines whose scholars show very little time in training in the Japanese language are Art, Economics, and Law. These areas have obvious similarities in that they emphasize comparative and theoretical studies. Art historians and lawyers have a very high rate of collaboration with Japanese scholars (53% and 100%), and economists have collaborated somewhat more than average. None rely on sources written in Japanese as completely as do historians, or, in this case, political scientists.

Finally, those in Linguistics have, as a whole, studied longer in both countries than average, as would be expected.

In summary, the questionnaire survey confirms what we would expect: that there is a correlation between years studied and adequacy of language training, and the beginning levels

are best studied early and intensively. Most of the members of the Japanese field have studied in the United States; only 9% have studied in Japan without also studying in the United States, while 41% have studied only in the United States, leaving half of the total studying both places. This is a pattern which will almost certainly spread in the future.

7. Financing of Japanese Language Training

Major sources are listed below (the categories are not mutually exclusive):

- 38% used government grants such as NDFL.
- 31% used their own or their families resources.
- 30% used money received from their colleges or universities.
- 26% used money from private foundations.
- 13% used government money such as GI Bill grants.

D. Communication and Collaboration with Japanese Scholars

1. Communication with Japanese Scholars

Straight compilation of answers yields another confirmation of the obvious, that communication with Japanese scholars is inadequate, and that, at least in theory, most scholars in America are anxious for more, and for more efficient communication. Personal inertia probably plays a great role in lack of communication, although, as many collaborators have pointed out, collaboration generally produces less, though of a higher quality, for more energy expended.

Of the respondents 50% have regular contacts with Japanese scholars, 47% have occasional contacts, and 3% have virtually none at all. A total of 46% think that the frequency and content of their contacts with Japanese scholars are adequate, and the other 54% think that they are not. Significantly, only 28% of the respondents also believed that the findings of Japanese scholars are adequately communicated to scholars in this country, while 72% think that they are not. Clearly, communication is considered less than adequate.

a. Regularity of Contacts with Japanese Scholars

The general average was 50% who had regular contacts with Japanese scholars. Whether or not one had frequent contacts depended on one's discipline: the people in disciplines requiring relatively advanced language training in Japanese had fewer contacts than those in the social sciences and other disciplines which have relatively less well-developed language skills. Religion, Linguistics, Language/Literature, and History all were disciplines where fewer than half the scholars had regular contacts. Political Science, Anthropology, Economics, Art, and Sociology and Law were the disciplines

more than half of whose scholars had regular contacts. Age was also a factor: 59% of all scholars over forty have regular contacts while only 40% of those under 41 have regular contacts. The age group 31-40 had the smallest percentage with regular contacts, 39%.

	<u>Percentage Who Have Regular Contacts</u>	<u>Percentage Who Have Adequate Contacts</u>
Percentage of Aggregate	50%	46%
AGE:		
20-30	45%	41%
31-40	39%	50%
41-50	55%	42%
51-60	68%	48%
61+	60%	44%
DISCIPLINE:		
Anthropology	57%	42%
Art	67%	47%
Economics	64%	55%
History	48%	40%
Language/Literature	38%	44%
Law	100%	100%
Linguistics	33%	50%
Political Science	54%	46%
Religion	*	50%
Sociology	67%	67%

*insufficient sample

b. Adequacy of the Communication of the Findings of
Japanese Scholars to Scholars in the United States

The table below shows the percentages of those who think that there is adequate communication of the findings of Japanese scholars by age and discipline group, and in comparison with the percentages for those groups who think that their personal contacts with Japanese scholars are adequate from the standpoint of frequency and content. Considering the percentage figures for those who do feel that the frequency and content of their contacts is adequate, it is significant that a large number think that their Japanese colleagues' findings are not adequately made available in America. Especially notable in this regard are the disciplines of Anthropology, Political Science, Sociology, and Law. For example, 67% of the sociologists have adequate contacts with individual Japanese scholars, but a mere 8% think that the findings of Japanese scholars are sufficiently well communicated to scholars in this country.

	Communication of Findings by Japanese Scholars is Adequate	Adequate Communica- tion with Japanese Scholars
AGE:		
20-30	17%	41%
30-40	33%	50%
41-50	24%	42%
51-60	37%	48%
61+	11%	44%
DISCIPLINE:		
Anthropology	18%	42%
Art	50%	47%
Economics	40%	55%
History	28%	40%
Language/Literature	43%	44%
Law	40%	100%
Linguistics	40%	50%
Political Science	11%	46%
Religion	*	*
Sociology	8%	67%
Aggregate Percentage	28%	46%

*insufficient sample

2. Collaboration with Japanese Scholars

a. Number of Times Respondents Have Collaborated, and Desire to Collaborate

62% of the respondents have never collaborated with a Japanese scholar

27% have collaborated once or twice

86% would like to collaborate with a Japanese scholar again, or for the first time, as the case may be.

The table below shows percentages for age groups and by discipline of respondents who have collaborated at least once, together with the percentages of those who would like to collaborate again or for the first time.

The tabulation by age contains no surprises. The disciplinary tabulation is somewhat more complex. First, anthropologists have done considerable collaboration, and are strongly interested in collaborating further. The same holds true for lawyers and sociologists. Political scientists and economists have done much less collaborative work than might

be anticipated. Only scholars in Language/Literature and Religion have done very little collaboration and show comparatively little interest in it.

	<u>Have Collaborated At Least Once</u>	<u>Would Like to Col- laborate Again, or For the First Time</u>
AGE:		
20-30	19%	86%
31-40	28%	87%
41-50	55%	84%
51-60	41%	96%
61+	33%	63%
DISCIPLINE:		
Anthropology	58%	92%
Art	53%	87%
Economics	40%	100%
History	28%	85%
Language/Literature	21%	79%
Law	100%	100%
Linguistics	50%	83%
Political Science	44%	88%
Religion	25%	50%
Sociology	54%	100%
Percentage of Aggregate	38%	86%

b. Organized Programs of Collaboration

Of all the respondents, 13% are members of organized programs of collaboration, research, or communication with Japanese scholars. The breakdown by discipline is as follows:

Anthropology	8%
Art	0%
Economics	40%
History	15%
Language/Literature	0%
Law	80%
Linguistics	25%
Political Science	15%
Religion	0%
Sociology	18%

This table follows the general pattern of the previous tables on collaboration, except in the case of Anthropology.

c. Adequacy of Language Training and
Desire to Collaborate

There is a greater tendency for those who have had relatively inadequate training in Japanese language to want to collaborate with Japanese scholars than for those whose training was relatively adequate (92% vs. 84%): this difference, of course, is related to the fact that those in social science disciplines generally have less adequate training than those in, say, History, Language/Literature, and Religion. Despite this, there is a very slight tendency for those whose training was relatively adequate to have collaborated a greater number of times than those whose training was relatively inadequate.

Finally, it should be noted that in general, the greater the number of times a respondent has collaborated the more likely he is to want to collaborate again. Where 80% who have never collaborated are interested in trying it, 88% who have collaborated once or twice would like to do so again, and 100% of those who have collaborated more than five times would like to work again with Japanese scholars.

E. Research Trips

1. Research Trips to Japan

a. Length of Trips

48.5% spent 12 months or less as students in Japan (for almost all of these respondents this time was spent doing dissertation research). 33% spent no time in Japan. The median for students was 13-24 months. Over 66% of the respondents have spent one year or less as faculty members doing research in Japan. A surprising 32% have spent no time as faculty members in residence in Japan for research purposes. The median for faculty members was 1-6 months.

b. Number of Trips

The median number of research trips to Japan was two. 14% have never been to Japan for research, either as faculty or as students. 52% have gone once or twice, 26% have gone three to five times, and 8% have gone more than five times.

c. Financing for Research Trips

1) Sources of Funds

Various means were used to finance trips to Japan. 18% used their own money. 46% used funds granted from their colleges or universities (some of which were originally foundation or government money). 33.5% have used Fulbright grants. 7.5% used funds available under the National Defense

Education Act. 20% used funds derived from government sources other than the NDEA and Fulbright Acts. 36% used money from Ford Foundation or the ACLS-SSRC. 26% used money available from other private foundations.

2) Adequacy of Funds

Surprisingly, 40% thought funds for research trips to Japan were relatively adequate (about 20% thought that they were "good" and 20% thought that they were "less than good"). Nevertheless, it is instructive that by far the largest category was the 36% who thought funding was quite inadequate. A breakdown by academic rank of those who think funding is adequate is revealing:

Rank	Funding is Good		Funding Less Than Good		Funding is Rela- tively Good
Graduate Student	33%	+	9%	=	42%
Lecturer/Instructor	15%	+	10%	=	25%
Assistant Professor	19%	+	19%	=	38%
Associate Professor	14%	+	20%	=	34%
Professor	22%	+	23%	=	45%
Percentage of Aggregate	20%	+	20%	=	40%

From the above figures we see that the graduate student, presumably doing research for his dissertation, and the established professor received more adequate funding than the men in the middle. The adequacy of funding for trips for teaching faculty without PhD's is also notably lower than other categories. The academic limbo in which the language instructor is placed is described by one respondent who wrote: "As a Japanese language instructor I see the need for special funds for those who do not hold a PhD to carry out research and study projects in Japan. This would permit an updating of language usage and a broader exchange with Japanese scholars."

The general milieu in which respondents work is closely connected to the adequacy of funding for research trips to Japan. The connection is most obvious when one measures responses from scholars from institutions which support area programs as against those from institutions which do not. Clearly East Asian programs provide leverage to extract funds for research trips, thereby assisting scholars in the field and causing them to perceive generally positive attitude toward their institutions. It will be recalled that an average of 40% of our respondents found that funds for research trips were relatively adequate. Of the respondents at institutions where there was an East Asian program (73% of the whole), 41% thought there was relatively adequate funding. At those places where there was no interdepartmental program, only 26%

had relatively adequate funding for trips, and fully 56% thought that funding was quite inadequate. The complete table appears as follows:

<u>Quality of Funding</u>	<u>East Asian Program</u>	<u>No Program</u>
Good	23%	11%
Less than Good	18%	15%
Relatively Adequate	41%	26%
Not very Adequate	25%	18%
Quite Inadequate	34%	56%
	100%	100%

2. Research in America

a. State of Research

19% think that research in their field on Japan is excellent.

35% think that it is in a fairly good state.

38% think that research in their field is fairly rudimentary.

8% think that it is in a feeble or primitive state.

While a majority are somewhat pleased if not satisfied with the state of research in their fields on Japan, still the largest single category reflects considerable room for improvement in quality. By discipline, the percentages of those who think that the state of research in their fields was either "excellent" or "fairly good" are as follows:

Anthropology	42%
Art	60%
Economics	82%
History	65%
Language/Literature	53%
Law	60%
Linguistics	67%
Political Science	35%
Religion	50%
Sociology	23%
Percentage of Aggregate	54%

b. Adequacy of Funding for Research

Questioned on the adequacy of funding for personal

research, 34% thought that funding was adequate, while 66% thought that it was not. It is not surprising that there is a definite correlation between those respondents who had adequate funding for research and those who had adequate funding for research trips. Also there is a correlation between attitudes towards institutions and the adequacy of funding for research. Thus, only 25% of those who operated under relatively discouraging attitudes had sufficient research funds.

The following breakdown of responses by discipline shows a broad range of divergence:

<u>Discipline</u>	<u>Relatively Adequate Funding for Research</u>
Anthropology	44%
Art	25%
Economics	20%
History	39%
Language/Literature	45%
Law	25%
Linguistics	0%
Political Science	23%
Religion	33%
Sociology	23%
Percentage of Aggregate	34%

It would seem that the disciplines which find the funding situation most encouraging are those which traditionally have shown the most reliance on the area approach: History, Language and Literature, and Anthropology.

c. Libraries

Only about 50% of the respondents are relatively happy about the conditions of the Japanese collections in their institutional libraries, and only a little over one-half feel dependent on those libraries. Real satisfaction is found only at the major centers. Interestingly enough, almost 50% of the members of the field solve their research problems by using their private collections and materials, or by having special material sent directly to them from Japan. Almost 25% make primary use of libraries at other than their own institutions. About 15% make primary use of inter-library loan.

F. Teaching

1. Teaching in the Japan Field

a. Number of Years Taught

11% of the respondents have not taught in a college

or university. 33% have not taught a course exclusively on Japan.

- 19% have taught 1-3 years at a college/university.
- 31% have taught 4-8 years.
- 19% have taught 9-15 years.
- 12% have taught 16-20 years.
- 8% have taught over 20 years.

b. Number of Years of Teaching Exclusively on Japan

- 25% have taught courses exclusively on Japan for 1-3 years.
- 22% have taught courses exclusively on Japan for 4-8 years.
- 20% have taught courses exclusively on Japan for more than 8 years.

c. Number of Students in Classes Exclusively on Japan

- 34% have no undergraduates in their classes.
- 44% have no graduate students in their classes.
- 23% have 1-5 graduate students in their classes.
- 20% have 6-10 graduate students in their classes.
- 13% have more than 10 graduate students in their classes.
- 17% have 10 or fewer undergraduates in their classes.
- 16% have 11-20 undergraduates in their classes.
- 17% have 21-35 undergraduates in their classes.
- 16% have over 35 undergraduates in their classes.

d. Adequacy of Materials for Teaching Purposes

It was difficult to obtain a statistical picture of the adequacy of teaching materials for the Japanese field. For no type of teaching aide did more than 50% of the respondents express satisfaction. The greatest improvement can be made in slides and films, although not many use these materials in teaching. Textbooks appear especially inadequate in Linguistics, Law, Economics, and Political Science. Source books are needed especially in History and Political Science. Teachers of Language and Literature appear rather more self-satisfied with their teaching materials, a condition which would no doubt be debated by their students, however.

2. Training Students Within a Discipline

a. Number of Graduate Students Under Direction

57% of the respondents have no graduate students under their personal direction; 34% have one to 5; and 9% have

more than 5. 78% have never supervised a PhD dissertation. Only 9% have supervised more than 4.

b. Attitudes of Departments to Graduate Students

77% thought that their departments treated their graduate students in the Japan field as well as others. (Some of these are members of departments such as East Asian Languages, however.) 23% thought that their graduate students were treated unfavorably. The greatest category, however, was comprised of those who thought that their students were treated relatively favorably, but as exotics.

c. Opportunities for PhD's in the Japan Field

Over 88% thought that there would be either excellent or good opportunities for PhD's in the Japan field in teaching. There was a similar response, though not nearly so certain (49% did not answer), concerning the need for PhD's in the Japan field in other professions.

G. Japan Specialists and the Universities

1. Attitudes of Colleges/Universities to Work Done by Respondents as Specialists on Japan

48% felt that they operated under encouraging attitudes toward their work as Japan specialists at their institutions. 31% thought that they were considered, in the words of one respondent, "exotic but loveable." 15% operated under attitudes both exotic and unloving, and 6% thought the attitudes shown by their universities were quite discouraging. There was a definite correlation between these responses and the institutional commitment toward area studies in general.

2. Future of Japanese Studies at Respondents' Institutions

72% believed that the future of Japanese Studies at their institutions was either excellent or fairly bright, with the greatest percentage in the latter category. The rest were pessimistic, with 13% prophesying the not distant demise of Japanese studies on their campuses.

3. Presence of East Asian Programs and Their Effects

There is a positive correlation between the presence of an interdepartmental East Asian program on campus on how respondents feel they are looked upon as specialists on Japan. While in general about 79% claim to operate under encouraging attitudes at their universities, the percentage for scholars whose institutions have East Asian programs is 85%, and the figure for those respondents without such a program is only 58%. Very few of the respondents at major centers were dis-

gruntled, while 55% of those who teach at colleges and universities without area programs, twice the percentage for the aggregate, were pessimistic about the future. Clearly the lone scholar still finds it hard to make his way either in his department or the institution as a whole.

4. Future of Japanese Studies and the Area Approach

The opinions on the future of the area approach showed a strong discipline-area dichotomy. Respondents in Law, Sociology, Language/Literature, and Political Science saw the future of Japanese studies at their institutions as relatively bright. Economists and Anthropologists were not nearly so optimistic. Other disciplines approximated the general average of 72%.

It is interesting to compare the percentages by discipline of the opinions on the future of area programs in general and the future of Japanese studies at specific institutions. The table below shows the percentages of those respondents who think that the future of Japanese studies at their institutions is relatively bright (quite bright or fairly bright) and the percentages of respondents who think that the future of area programs, particularly those in Japan, in general, is relatively bright (quite bright or will grow somewhat):

	<u>Japanese Studies</u>	
	<u>At Respondents' Institutions</u>	<u>As an Area Program, in General</u>
Anthropology	52%	60%
Art	67%	63%
Economics	50%	70%
History	71%	62%
Language/Literature	88%	73%
Law	100%	60%
Linguistics	67%	*
Political Science	77%	52%
Religion	*	*
Sociology	91%	50%
Percentage of Aggregate	72%	63%

*Insufficient sample

The most important differences between the two sets of figures occur in Political Science and Sociology. These two social sciences are quite clearly looking toward a movement away from the area approach and toward the disciplines.

5. Number of Institutions Giving Training in Japanese Studies in the United States

59% of the respondents thought that there were a suf-

ficient number of institutions giving graduate training in the Japan field. Of those scholars at the top eight degree-granting institutions in the field, 74% thought that there were enough institutions giving graduate training.

Only 32% of the respondents thought that there were a sufficient number of institutions giving undergraduate training in the Japan field. The figure for scholars at the top eight degree-granting institutions was 47%.

Opinion on whether there are enough graduate or undergraduate institutions in the Japan field depended largely on the type of institution from which the respondents answered. Emphatic "yes" responses came from the major centers, while those from lesser centers were quite divided in opinion. Respondents from lone scholars were overwhelmingly in favor of more institutions giving graduate and undergraduate training.

	<u>Sufficient Number of Institutions Giving Graduate Training</u>	<u>Sufficient Number of Institutions Giving Under- graduate Training</u>
Percentage of Aggregate	59%	32%
Top Degree-Granting Institutions	74%	47%
Smaller Centers	69%	40%
Lone Scholars	50%	21%

The breakdown by discipline of opinions regarding the sufficiency of the number of institutions giving training in the Japan field appears below, and may serve as another index to those fields which feel themselves weakest, at least in terms of personnel:

	<u>Sufficient Number of Institutions Giving Graduate Training</u>	<u>Sufficient Number of Institutions Giving Under- graduate Training</u>
Percentage of Aggregate	59%	32%
Anthropology	52%	37%
Art	55%	33%
Economics	29%	14%
History	65%	35%
Language/Literature	68%	27%
Law	60%	60%
Linguistics	33%	33%
Political Science	52%	23%
Religion	x	x
Sociology	63% 142	57%

APPENDIX 4a

Pre-Doctoral Fellowships Available
for Japanese Studies

Fellowships for pre-doctoral training and research are available from a variety of sources. Figures are available for the following national programs:

- FAFP - Foreign Area Fellowship Program (Ford)
- NDFL - National Defense Foreign Language Fellowships (# NDEA Title VI)
- NDEA - Title IV of the National Defense Education Act
- STATE - State Department Fulbright Program (International Educational and Cultural Exchange Program)
- HEW - Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act (Fulbright-Hays)
- NSF - National Science Foundation

Figures are difficult to obtain for other sources such as individual graduate schools and minor or occasional foundation awards.

Table I shows the distribution by source for fellowships in all areas of Asian studies (i.e., East Asia, Southeast Asia, and South Asia).

I. PRE-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS AVAILABLE FOR ASIAN STUDIES

	FAFP	NDFL	NDEA Title IV	STATE	HEW	NSF
63-64	75	343	13	45	30	14
64-65	70	312	13	48	30	16
65-66	49	464	25	73	28	19
66-67	34	552	43	54	48	21
67-68	38	718	61	46	41	21
68-69	47	716	66	40	33	21
Total	314	3,104	221	261	180	112

As Table I shows, the major source of fellowships is NDFL (74%). Table II shows the distribution of NDFL grants for the various languages which comprise the East Asian region. Table III shows the breakdown by regional distribution of grants from the five major sources supporting Japanese studies. As can be seen Japanese studies receive about 23% of all area study grants in the Asian field. This in turn is roughly 10% of all awards made under the NDFL program. Within the East Asian studies group, Japan occupies 37% of the total. Comparison of the number of NDFL grants made to the major "critical languages" appears in Table IV.

II. NDFL GRANTS IN EAST ASIAN STUDIES

<u>Language</u>	<u>1959</u>	<u>1960</u>	<u>1961</u>	<u>1962</u>	<u>1963</u>	<u>1964</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>Total</u>
Chinese	32	64	101	133	120	125	198	225	278	1276
Japanese	24	64	100	103	80	61	106	125	172	835
Mongolian	--	3	4	3	3	6	4	2	2	27
Korean	--	1	5	10	11	10	12	18	9	76
Tibetan	--	1	2	2	4	4	5	3	6	27
Total for East Asia	56	133	212	251	218	206	325	373	467	2241
Total for Program	171	472	769	1006	902	865	1320	1442	1828	8775
Percent of total for East Asia	33%	28%	28%	25%	24%	24%	25%	26%	26%	26%
Percent of total for Japanese Studies	14%	13%	13%	10%	9%	7%	9%	9%	9%	10%
Percent of total for East Asian devoted to Japan	43%	50%	50%	40%	33%	30%	32%	33%	37%	37%

III. PRE-DOCTORAL FELLOWSHIPS IN ASIAN STUDIES
BY PROGRAM AND REGION, 1963-64

	<u>FAPP</u>	<u>HEW</u>	<u>STATE</u>	<u>NDFL</u>
India, Ceylon, Nepal	22	11	19	97
Pakistan	--	--	4	--
Afghanistan	--	1	--	--
<u>South Asia (Subtotal)</u>	22	12	23	97
China	21	6	4	120
Japan	17	9	8	80
Korea	3	--	--	11
East Asia--Other	--	--	--	3
<u>East Asia (Subtotal)</u>	41	15	12	214
SEA Mainland	3	2	1	21
Indonesia	8	1	6	10
Philippines	1	--	6	1
<u>SEA (Subtotal)</u>	12	3	13	32
Total	75	30	48	343
Percentage of total for Japan	23%	30%	17%	23%

IV. NATIONAL DEFENSE FOREIGN LANGUAGE FELLOWS GRADUATE
AWARDS IN LANGUAGES RECEIVING MAJOR SUPPORT

	<u>1959-64</u>	<u>1965</u>	<u>1966</u>	<u>1967</u>	<u>1968</u>	<u>1969</u>
Arabic	476	127	120	165	178	168
Chinese	575	198	225	278	267	253
Hindi-Urdu	320	68	93	127	148	145
Japanese	432	106	125	172	146	172
Portuguese	302	100	123	134	129	106
Russian	826	202	200	294	283	275
Spanish	289	158	149	165	147	145
Total	3220	959	1035	1335	1298	1264

APPENDIX 4b

Pre-Doctoral Fellowships Available for Field
Research in Japanese Studies

Appendix 4a provided information on the availability of fellowships for graduate study of Japan both in the United States and in the field. Overall figures for grants for research abroad under four major sources are as follows:

	<u>FAFD</u>	<u>STATE</u>	<u>HEW</u>	<u>NDFL</u>
63-64	49	--	--	46
64-65	45	48	30	11
65-66	33	73	28	26
66-67	25	54	48	35
67-68	31	46	41	24
68-69	38	40	33	37
Total	221	261	180	179

The significant observation from these figures is that when it goes for research and study outside the United States, the NDFL contribution diminishes in importance to about 21%, while the FAFD and Fulbright programs grow proportionately larger. As Appendix 4c shows through the example of the FAFD program, the above four sources have played the major role in providing the advanced area training for scholars entering the Japanese field.

APPENDIX 4c

Foreign Area Fellows who Studied in Japan
1958-1969

Note: A certain per cent of the Fellows listed are not strictly speaking Japanese specialists, being primarily concerned with China or Southeast Asia.

<u>Anthropology</u>	<u>Degree Institution</u>
Beardsley, Richard K.	California, Berkeley
Donoghue, John D.	Chicago
Plath, David W.	Harvard
<u>Art</u>	
Dohrenwend, Doris	Harvard
French, Calvin	Columbia
La Plante, John David	Stanford
Meech, Julia	Harvard
Murose, Miyeko	Columbia
Young, Martie Wing	Harvard
<u>Economics</u>	
Emerson, John	Harvard
Hanley, Susan	Yale
Iwamoto, Kiyotoshi	Utah
Kinney, Mrs. Ann Rasmussen	Columbia
Levine, Solomon	MIT
Martin, Benjamin	California, Berkeley
Nakamura, James	Columbia
Patrick, Hugh	Michigan
Rapp, William	Stanford
Racoski, Thomas	Harvard
Saxonhouse, Gary	Yale
Sergeant, John	California, Berkeley
Tussing, Arlon	Washington
<u>Education</u>	
Singleton, John	Stanford
<u>Geography</u>	
Eyre, John	Michigan

History

Abosch, David
 Allinson, Gary
 Bailey, Jackson
 Beckmann, George
 Bernstein, Gail
 Blakeley, Barry
 Brown, Sidney
 Callahan, Paul
 Cody, Cecil
 Cole, Allan
 Crowley, James
 Dull, Paul
 Duus, Peter
 Elison, George
 Falconeri, Gennaro Ralph
 Frost, Peter
 Friedland, Paul
 Grieder, Jerome
 Hall, Ivan
 Havens, Thomas
 Hurst, Cameron
 Jansen, Marius
 Kiley, Cornelius
 Lamberti, Matthew
 Lewis, Charlton
 Mancall, Mark
 Mayo, Marlene
 McGrane, George
 Mitchell, Peter
 Moore, Ray
 Morris, Jr., Virgil
 Morton, William
 Mote, Frederick
 Notehelfer, Fred G.
 Palais, James
 Paschall, Garland
 Pyle, Kenneth
 Rosenbaum, Arthur
 Sakakida, Evelyn
 Scheiner, Irwin
 Schurmann, H. Franz
 Sheldon, Charles
 Sheridan, James
 Shirley, James
 Smethhurst, Richard
 Smith, Henry II
 Speidel, William
 Terry, Charles
 Thompson, Phillip
 Tyler, Royall

Degree Institution

California, Berkeley
 Stanford
 Harvard
 Stanford
 Harvard
 Michigan
 Wisconsin
 Harvard
 Washington
 Chicago
 Michigan
 Washington
 Harvard
 Harvard
 Michigan
 Harvard
 Washington
 Harvard
 Harvard
 California, Berkeley
 Columbia
 Harvard
 Harvard
 Columbia
 California, Berkeley
 Harvard
 Columbia
 Columbia
 Indiana
 Michigan
 Washington
 Columbia
 Washington
 Princeton
 Harvard
 Washington
 Stanford
 Yale
 Harvard
 Michigan
 Harvard
 California, Berkeley
 California, Berkeley
 California, Berkeley
 Michigan
 Harvard
 Yale
 Columbia
 California, Berkeley
 Columbia

History (continued)

Webb, Herschel
 Wechsler, Howard
 Wilbur, C. Martin
 Wilson, George
 Wright, Mary

Degree Institution

Columbia
 Yale
 Columbia
 Harvard
 Radcliffe

International Relations

Edwards, Jay Dixon
 McGarry, Jr., James
 Packard, George
 Thayer, Nathaniel
 Weinstein, Martin

Columbia
 Pennsylvania
 Fletcher School, Tufts
 Columbia
 Columbia

Language and Literature

Araki, James
 Backus, Robert
 Brazell, Karen
 Chaves, Jonathan
 Cranston, Edwin
 Gentzler, Jr., Jennings
 Halzman, Donald
 Harper, Thomas
 Iwamoto, Yoshio
 Jones, Jr., Stanleigh
 Keene, Donald
 Lane, Richard
 Lynn, Richard
 McCullough, William
 Naff, William
 Royston, Clifton
 Ruch, Barbara
 Ryan, Marleigh
 Seidensticker, Jr., Edward
 Viglielmo, Valdo
 Wang, Lily
 Watson, Burton
 Willis, Donald
 Wrenn, James
 Zolbrod, Leon

California, Berkeley
 California, Berkeley
 Columbia
 Columbia
 Stanford
 Columbia
 Yale
 Michigan
 Michigan
 Columbia
 Columbia
 Columbia
 Stanford
 California, Berkeley
 Washington
 Michigan
 Columbia
 Columbia
 Columbia
 Harvard
 Radcliffe
 Columbia
 Washington
 Yale
 Columbia

Law

Jensen, Norman
 Rabinowitz, Richard

California, Berkeley
 Yale Law School

Linguistics

Austerlitz, Robert
 Lange, Roland

Columbia
 Michigan

	<u>Degree Institution</u>
<u>Linguistics (continued)</u>	
Miller, Roy Andrew	California, Berkeley
Shirato, Ichiro	Columbia
Stuart, Don	Columbia
<u>Musicology</u>	
Garfias, Robert	UCLA
Malm, William	UCLA
<u>Philosophy and Religion</u>	
Dilworth, David	Columbia
Inada, Kenneth	Tokyo
Wargo, Robert	Michigan
Weinstein, Stanley	Harvard
<u>Political Science</u>	
Austin, Lewis	MIT
Baerwald, Hans	California, Berkeley
Campbell, John	Columbia
Colton, Hattie	Minnesota
Hellmann, Donald	California, Berkeley
Ike, Nobutaka	Johns Hopkins
Johnson, Chalmers	California, Berkeley
Levenbach, Fritz	Michigan
Massey, Joseph	Yale
Steiner, Kurt	Stanford
Steslicke, William	Michigan
Talbott, Nathan	Washington
Teters, Barbara	Washington
Thurston, Donald	Columbia
Titus, David	Columbia
White, James	Stanford
<u>Sociology</u>	
Abegglen, James	Chicago
Rosman, Gilbert	Princeton
Yashino, I. Roger	Southern California

ANALYSIS

1. Institutional Distribution of Awards

Columbia	34
Harvard	27
California, Berkeley	17
Michigan	14
Stanford	10
Washington	10
Yale	9
Chicago	3
MIT	2
Princeton	2
UCLA	2
Indiana	1
Johns Hopkins	1
Minnesota	1
Pennsylvania	1
Southern California	1
Tokyo	1
Tufts	1
Utah	1

2. Distribution of Awards by Field

Anthropology	3
Art	6
Economics	13
Education	1
Geography	1
History	56
International Relations	5
Language and Literature	25
Law	2
Linguistics	5
Music	2
Philosophy and Religion	4
Political Science	16
Sociology	3

Total 142

APPENDIX 4d

Joint ACLS-SSRC Asian Program Awards
in Japanese Studies
 1958-1969

Sources of support for post-doctoral travel and research are so varied that statistical tables of awards to individuals cannot be constructed with any accuracy. The Joint ACLS-SSRC Asian Program serves as one of the main sources of support on a national basis. The gap between demand and availability of grants is revealed in the following data for the 1958-1969 period:

Total number of applicants	200
Total number of awards	47
Percentage of applicants who received awards	23%
Total amount of awards	\$189,852
Average amount of award	\$4,000

ANNEX A

Annual Lists of Award Winners1958

AUSTERLITZ, Robert (Linguistics, Columbia)
 DULL, Paul (History and Political Science, Oregon)
 HARRISON, John (History, Florida)
 LIU, James (History, Pittsburgh)

Total applicants: 15
 Total amount of awards: \$15,000

1959

CORNELL, John (Anthropology, Texas)
 KUBLIN, Hyman (History, Brooklyn College)
 TENG, S. Y. (History, Indiana)

Total applicants not recorded
 Total amount of awards: \$5630

1960

FLERSHEM, Robert (History, Pennsylvania)
 MENDEL, Douglas Jr. (Political Science, California)
 SAKAI, Robert (History, Nebraska)
 TIEDEMANN, Arthur (History, City University of New York)

Total applicants: 17
 Total amount of awards: \$14,890

1961

CRAIG, Albert (History, Harvard)
 IKEDA, Hiroko (Asian and Pacific Languages, Hawaii)
 ROSENFELD, John (Fine Arts, Harvard)
 TIEDEMANN, Arthur (History, City University of New York)
 YANAGA, Chitoshi (Political Science, Yale)

Total applicants: 21
 Total amount of awards: \$31,039

1962

BAERWALD, Hans (Political Science, California)
 HOLLERMAN, Leon (Statistics, Claremont Men's College)
 MALM, William (Music, Michigan)
 ROSENFELD, John (Fine Arts, Harvard)

Total applicants: 24
 Total amount of awards: \$16,400

1963

DATOR, James Allen (College of Law and Politics, St. Paul's University)
 HALL, John (History, Yale)
 PLATH, David (Sociology and Anthropology, Iowa)
 SMITH, Thomas (History, Stanford)

Total applicants: 20
 Total amount of awards: \$14,750

1964

EYRE, John (Geography, North Carolina)
 LAMLEY, Harry (History, Hawaii)
 SILBERMAN, Bernard (Oriental Studies, Arizona)
 TEELE, Roy (English, Texas)

Total applicants: 15
 Total amount of awards: \$6,843

1965

ABOSCH, David (History, Colorado)
 CHAMBLISS, William (History, Kentucky)
 KURODA, Yasumasa (Political Science, Southern California)
 RAMSDELL, Daniel (History, Bowling Green State)

Total applicants: 11
 Total amount of awards: \$20,500

1966

BAILEY, Don Clifford (Oriental Studies, Arizona)
 GUSTFIELD, Joseph (Sociology, Illinois)
 NIYEKAWA, Agnes (Linguistics, Hawaii)

Total applicants: 18
 Total amount of awards: \$6,000

1967

ADRIAANSZ, Willem (Music, Washington)
 DUUS, Peter (History, Harvard)
 ELSBREE, Willard (Government, Ohio)
 HAROOTUNIAN, Harry (History, Rochester)
 OZAKI, Robert S. (Economics, California State College, Hayward)
 SCHEINER, Irwin (History, California at Berkeley)
 TOTMAN, Conrad D. (History, Northwestern)

Total applicants: 24
 Total amount of awards: \$31,000

1968

BOCK, Felicia G. (Oriental Languages, California, Berkeley)
 BULLING, Anneliese G. (Art and Archeology, Columbia)
 MARSHALL, Byron K. (History, Minnesota)
 SILBERMAN, Bernard S. (History, Duke)
 TIEDEMANN, Arthur E. (History, City College of New York)

Total applicants: 23
 Total amount of awards: \$27,500

1969

Total applicants: 33

APPENDIX 4e

Distribution of Grants Awarded by the Board of Foreign Scholarships (Fulbright and Fulbright-Hays Programs)*

I. FOREIGN AREA AND LANGUAGE TRAINING GRANTS

Area and Country	<u>Graduate Fellow- ships</u>		<u>Center Faculty</u>		<u>Research/ Study</u>		<u>Summer Seminars</u>		<u>Foreign Studies Extension</u>		<u>Curricu- lum Spe- cialists</u>		<u>Foreign Totals</u>	
	64-67	68	64-67	68	64-67	68	64-67	68	67	68	64-67	68	64-67	68
EAST ASIA AND PACIFIC														
Total	96	24	59	15	13	6	126(6)		43(3)	60(3)	6	2	343	107
China, Rep. of	30	9	18	2		1			33(2)	15(1)		1	81	28
Hong Kong	8	1	7	1	1								16	2
Indonesia	2	2		1		1							2	4
Japan	43	10	25	6	12	4	86(4)			25(1)	5	1	171	46
Korea	2		1	1									3	1

*Compiled from Reviewing the Commitment, A Report on Academic Exchanges, Board of Foreign Scholarships, October, 1969.

II. GRANTS FOR EDUCATIONAL EXCHANGE*

Country	GRANTS TO U.S. CITIZENS										GRANTS TO FOREIGN NATIONALS
	University Study		Advanced Research		Teaching or Educational Seminars		University Lecturers		U.S. Totals, Cumulative		Total
	49-68	68-69	49-68	68-69	49-68	68-69	49-68	68-69	68-69	49-69	49-69
Australia	318	15	176	4	124	8	199	17	44	861	1,225
Belgium	284	10	70	2	61	2	50	2	16	481	768
China, Rep. of	38	3	112		3		98	7	10	261	374
France	4,217	146	413	11	468		393	18	175	5,628	6,157
Hong Kong	6		8		2		24	1	1	41	78
Indonesia					33	2	9		2	44	340
Japan	134	8	171	6	117		277	18	32	731	4,923
Korea	8	1	1	1	4		57	6	8	78	545
New Zealand	138	5	106	2	74	2	40	2	11	369	481
Philippines	81	3	37		10		162	5	8	298	1,133
United Kingdom	2,286	87	384	13	1,905	77	387	21	198	5,160	6,960
USSR	287	28	65	4	133	22	20		54	559	549

*Fulbright grants cover two-way exchanges under the following categories: exchange of lecturers; exchange of research scholars; exchange of teachers; exchange of students. As the figures show, many more scholars are brought to the United States from abroad than are sent abroad from the United States.

III. U.S. GRADUATE STUDENTS IN JAPAN AS FULBRIGHT GRANTEES (1964-1969)

	<u>Field of Study</u>
<u>1964</u>	
Bonville, William D.	Architecture
Edwards, Robert	Legal Aspects of Japanese Trade
Hauser, William	Japanese History
Lille, Philip	Economics
Maeda, Robert	Chinese Landscape Painting
Minear, Richard	History
Webb, Glenn	Far East Art History
Zirbes, Georgette	Ceramics
<u>1965</u>	
Dolen, Richard	Theoretical Physics
Hadeishi, Nobuyuki	Painting
Hatch, George C.	Chinese History: Sung
Leiserson, Michael Avery	Political Science
Rubin, Jay A.	Modern Japanese Literature
Stull, Robert Jr.	Ceramics
Wintersteen, Prescott B. Jr.	Japanese History
<u>1966</u>	
Bedell, George D. IV	Japanese Studies
Chamberlain, Gordon Blanding	Anglo-Japanese Alliance
Hayden, George Allen	Chinese Drama
Oshiro, Kenji Kenneth	Cultural Geography
Plesums, Guntis	Architecture
Stevens, Charles Russell	Japanese Commercial Law
<u>1967</u>	
Berger, Gordon Mark	Modern Japanese History
Golas, Peter John	Chinese History: Sung
Gordon, Lonny Joe	Dance Theater
Masunaga, Joan Bernardine	Karate and NOH
Ratcliffe, Charles Tait	Economics
Stephan, John Jason	Japanese History
<u>1968</u>	
Berman, Stephen H.	Chinese Taoism
Davis, David Lee	Japanese History
Dreyer, Edward	Chinese History
Freeman, James Jay	Chinese Literature
Josephs, Lewis Samuels	Linguistics
Lee, Eugene H.	Comparative Law
Rosenberg, Patia Myrel	Traditional Japanese Folk Music
Yasko, Richard Anthony	Modern Japanese History

1969

Lazar, Edward J.

Markley, Richard C.

Mass, Jeffrey Paul

Novograd, Paul J.

Pempel, T. John

Rubinger, Richard

Shelby, Barry E.

Teaching English as a Foreign
Language

Japanese Language

Japanese History

Japanese Literature

Political Science: Japanese
Studies

Japanese Education

Teaching English as a Foreign
Language

APPENDIX 4f

Japanese Government Grants for Study
in Japan, 1955-1969

I. NUMBER OF THE MOMBUSHO SCHOLARSHIP GRANTEES RECEIVED

	<u>55-59</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>64</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>66</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>68</u>	
South-East Asia	184	44	74	71	70	137	130	159	145	176	1,190
Middle and Near East and Africa	11	5	8	8	8	18	18	13	18	19	126
Oceania	3	1		1		2	3	3	3	7	23
Europe and America	77	20	18	18	16	43	49	45	46	53	385
Total	275	70	100	98	94	200	200	220	212	255	1,724

II. NUMBER OF THE MOMBUSHO SCHOLARSHIP GRANTEES ENROLLED
 As of March 1, 1969

	<u>Undergraduate Students</u>	<u>Research Students</u>	<u>Students in Medicine or Dentistry</u>	<u>Total</u>
Asia	223	254	7	484
Middle and Near East	28	11	1	40
Africa		1		1
Oceania		4		4
North America		15		15
Central and South America		25		25
Europe		48		43
Total	251	348	8	617

APPENDIX 5

The Funding of Japanese Studies in American
Colleges and Universities

The sources of funding for Japanese studies, both public and private, are so numerous, and the aspects of Japanese studies, undergraduate, graduate and post-doctoral, are so diverse, that any attempted compilation of overall financial figures is apt to be incomplete. The authors of this report realize that a great deal more time than was available to them would be required to make possible a statistically sound financial statement for the field. What follows is an assessment which utilizes certain available figures in the light of what our study has revealed about the total membership, the research and training needs, and the institutional structure of the field.

I. EXTERNAL SUPPORT FOR JAPANESE STUDIES

The first four tables which follow are compiled on the basis of figures calculated by the Ford Foundation staff. They reveal the overall national investment in Asian studies for pre-doctoral and post-doctoral training and research. Table V reveals the amount of government support given to NDEA Centers for East Asian studies. From these figures it is possible to calculate a rough estimate of the magnitude of outside support given to Japanese studies in a given year. (The figures in this report are for the most part calculated for 1969.) It will be obvious that in this calculation there are very few statistically exact figures, since most available figures are given in terms of Asian studies or East Asian studies, and the Japanese component must be calculated by formula from them.

TABLE I. NATIONAL INVESTMENT IN PRE-DOCTORAL
FIELD RESEARCH IN ASIA*

(i.e., the research component of Table II)

	FAFP	HEW	STATE	NDEA	
68-69	266,500	233,985	221,862	138,750	861,097
Estimated Total					
1964-69	\$1,315,250	\$1,305,648	\$1,462,195	\$667,817	\$4,750,910

*Compiled on the basis of average fellowship costs for each program listed.

TABLE II

Total National Investment in Asian Components of Pre-Doctoral Fellowship Program
1968-69 and 1963-69 Estimate

	<u>FAPP</u>	<u>HEW (Fulbright)</u>	<u>State Dept. (Fulbright)</u>	<u>NDFL</u>	<u>University Centers (Ford ITR Support)</u>
68-69	420,963	233,648	221,862	2,685,000	441,891
Estimated Total 1963-69	\$2,266,807	\$1,305,648	\$1,462,190	\$11,862,168	\$2,651,346

	<u>NDEA Title IV</u>	<u>NSF</u>	<u>Four-Year Ford Fellows</u>	<u>Other Foundations</u>	<u>Miscellaneous</u>	<u>Total</u>
68-69	311,500	93,408	84,000	120,000	104,000	4,716,609
Estimated Total 1963-69	\$1,047,750	\$498,176	\$84,000	\$720,000	\$624,000	\$22,522,085

TABLE III

POST-DOCTORAL RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR ASIAN STUDIES BY SOURCE OF SUPPORT

	<u>State Dept. Fulbright Research Scholars</u>	<u>HEW Fulbright Center Faculty Fellows</u>	<u>NDFL Post- doctoral Fellows</u>	<u>Ford Foundation Grants</u>	<u>Other Foundations</u>	<u>Total</u>
1968-69	64,340	357,180	40,464	\$1,940,079	\$120,000	2,623,063
Estimated Total						
1964-65	\$538,327	\$1,307,864	\$458,402	\$1,940,079	\$120,000	\$4,364,672

TABLE IV

POST-DOCTORAL RESEARCH SUPPORT FOR INDIAN, CHINESE,
AND JAPANESE STUDIES IN 1968-69

	<u>India</u>	<u>China</u>	<u>Japan</u>
State Dept. Fulbright	\$ 21,332	--	\$ 32,000
HEW Fulbright Center Faculty Fellows	111,540	\$ 100,420	106,740
NDFL Post- doctoral	10,116	10,116	10,116
AIIS Faculty Research Fellows	152,900	--	--
Ford Founda- tion Grants	--	885,967	235,000
Other Foundations	--	--	--
AID	108,750	--	--
DOD	--	52,000	--
Total	\$404,638	\$1,048,503	\$383,856

Table II gives us a figure of \$4.7 million for government and foundation contributions to the pre-doctoral level of Asian Studies. Assuming that the Japanese portion of this figure is 23% (the Japanese share of all fellowships in Asian Studies), we have a figure of \$1,080,000 for the amount of outside support to pre-doctoral research and training.

Table IV shows that similar sources of support for post-doctoral research on Japan amounted to \$383,000 in 1968-69. Finally, Table V shows that NDEA Center support for East Asian Studies was \$1,442,650. The Japanese share of this is hard to determine but is probably close to the proportion of fellowships received out of the East Asian total (on an average about 30%). Approximately \$433,000 is added from this source.

TABLE V. FUNDING OF NDEA LANGUAGE AND AREA CENTERS
FOR EAST ASIAN STUDIES, 1969*

Arizona	55,000
Brown	28,240
Bucknell	23,000
California (Berkeley)	100,000
Chicago	53,000
Colorado	53,000
Columbia	139,000
Cornell	62,000
Dartmouth	36,000
Earlham	35,000
Harvard	134,900
Hawaii	82,650
Illinois	38,000
Iowa	42,500
Kansas	58,650
Manhattanville College	21,850
Michigan	68,000
Oakland	29,350
Oberlin	21,500
Pittsburgh	47,250
Princeton	50,000
Rochester	25,000
Southern California	58,620
Texas	43,000
Washington	73,940
Yale	53,200
Total	1,442,650

Total number of institutions: 26

*Education and World Affairs, Data Bank.

In total then we have:

For pre-doctoral support (this includes current foundation support)	\$1,080,000
For post-doctoral support	383,000
For center support	433,000
Total	\$1,896,000

In other words, we can assume a contribution in 1968-69 of approximately \$2 million from outside sources.

II. AN ASSESSMENT OF THE TOTAL COST OF JAPANESE STUDIES

The following calculation of the "total cost" of Japanese studies was worked out by Messrs. Levine and Weinstein on the basis of certain general data resulting from the committee's questionnaire and other sources.

1. Faculty salaries (1969-70) for 500 full-time equivalent faculty (300 full-timers plus 400 part-timers, as reported by Titus and Lambert), including 6 per cent fringe benefits. Salary levels are above average, but not the highest, reported for 1969-70 in the Bulletin of the American Association of University Professors. The proportions of full, associate, assistant professors and instructors in the Japanese field are based on the committee's report.

Salaries for 500 full-time equivalent faculty..	\$ 8,100,000
6 per cent fringe benefits.....	48,600
	<u>\$ 8,148,600</u>

2. Administrative overhead--estimated 30 per cent of salary figure.....\$ 2,430,000

3. Support for faculty research. Calculated at about 20 per cent of the salary figure, on the assumption that faculty devote one year of every five entirely to research, plus \$1,000 each to travel and \$500 each for research expenses for 100 faculty.....\$1,770,000

4. Library support--estimated at 10 per cent of faculty salaries.....\$ 810,000

5. Aid to graduate students. The recent Ford Foundation figures showed that in 1968-69, the government foundations awarded 178 pre-doctoral fellowships totalling approximately \$1,000,000 (\$5,000 per student, including travel) in Japanese studies. It is estimated that there are currently about 500 students enrolled in M.A. and Ph.D. programs in Japanese studies. Thus, in addition to those aided by the government and foundations, there are approximately 322 graduate students in the field, most of whom depend on university fellowships and assistantships for support. Assuming that university aid averages about \$2,500 per student, the universities are contributing approximately \$800,000 to graduate student support in Japanese studies. Total graduate student aid is...\$ 1,800,000

Estimated total cost of Japanese in our universities for 1969-70 is.....\$14,958,600

III. THE RELATIONSHIP OF EXTERNAL TO INTERNAL FUNDING

The above calculations reveal that at present the federal government and foundations contribute about \$2 million out of the total \$15 million annual expenditure for Japanese studies (13.3%). An extension of this calculation leads to the estimate that in the eleven years from 1958 to 1969, government and foundation contributions have totalled some \$19 million, in other words, somewhat over \$17 million annually. This estimate parallels the one made by the Joint Committee on Contemporary China in 1968 in its review of the field of Chinese Studies.* Their estimate is \$32 million for the period from 1959 to 1968. We have seen throughout most of the previous comparative statistics that Japanese studies has received between two-fifths and one-third of the amount going to Chinese studies.

Assuming the two figures \$15 million for total expense and \$2 million for the external contribution, what is the significance of external funding? By and large we can say that some 87% of the field's cost is met through the regular budgets of our colleges and universities. External funding plays its critical role not in the overall but in specific aspects of Japanese studies. Thus the \$2 million covers approximately 60% of graduate fellowship support, close to 80% of the pre-doctoral and post-doctoral travel and research funds, and nearly 100% of the support for program administration, special projects, organization activities, and the like.

It seems fair to conclude that while the universities have been bearing the main burden of supporting Japanese studies as an educational field, the government and foundations have been playing an absolutely vital role at the advanced training and research levels. Moreover this role continues into the future. The maintenance, growth, and quality of the field are dependent on the rate of faculty recruitment. Faculty recruitment, in turn, is determined by the amount of support available for the M.A. and Ph.D. candidates. In short, the future rate of growth of Japanese studies will be determined in large measure by the amount of funds allocated by the universities, and the government and foundations for aid to graduate students and to faculty.

*ACLS-SSRS Joint Committee on Contemporary China, "The Status of Studies of Modern and Contemporary China," March, 1968.

APPENDIX 6

A Projection of Manpower Requirements in
Japanese Studies, 1969-1979

The following calculation provided by Professor Levine is premised on the possibility and desirability that the field double itself within the coming decade.

"The need for a doubling presupposes a doubling of present enrollments in Japanese language at the college and university level. Professor John Young reported about 4,000 currently enrolled, 75% of which are in the first year. If you assume that (a) every year on the average there will be an addition of 250 new beginning students, (b) those enrolled in language represent the great bulk in all Japanese studies, and (c) there is a drop in the attrition rate from the present 75% to 50% from the 1st year of language to 2nd year and beyond, the total enrollment would about double between now and 1978-79. Assuming further that student-teacher ratios remain about the same, the full-time equivalent faculty needed would also double from the present 300 full-timers and 400 part-timers. I think the above are reasonable assumptions, given the growing interest and importance of Japanese studies, overall university growth, etc.--provided, of course, there is financial support.

"Now, where will the extra 700 people come from? This will depend upon reaching targets set for the output of MA's and Ph.D.'s. If 50% of those who do two years or more of Japanese language study pursue graduate degrees, the 1969-70 figure for graduate enrollment ought to be about 500, eventually say divided about three to one between MA and Ph.D. degree work. As the 1st year language enrollment increases by about 250 a year and the retention rate of going from 1st to 2nd year and beyond increases, this number ought to increase by at least 100 a year. Further, if we assume it takes two to three years to complete an M.A. and five to six years for a Ph.D., the picture should look something like the following:

<u>Year</u>	<u>M.A. Enrollments</u>	<u>M.A. Completions</u>	<u>Ph.D. Enrollments</u>	<u>Ph.D. Completions</u>
1969-70	400	75	100	25
1970-71	475	100	125	25
1971-72	550	125	150	25
1972-73	625	150	175	25
1973-74	700	175	200	50
1974-75	775	200	225	75
1975-76	850	250	250	75
1976-77	925	300	275	100
1977-78	1000	350	300	100
1978-79	1075	400	325	125
Totals		2,125		625

"Half of the Ph.D's, say about 300, probably would go into full-time university teaching. Almost all would be included in the 2,125 M.A.'s, so actually there would be only about 1500 "terminal" M.A.'s net, of which say one-third or about 500 go into university teaching (especially language teaching). This would give a total of about 800 persons, just about enough to double the present number given some attrition that will take place in the present 700. Assuming that about the same proportions as now exist for full-time and part-time, the full-time equivalent faculty would also double.

"The main point is that present M.A. enrollment would have to more than double and present Ph.D. enrollment about triple by 1978-79--going up at fairly steady annual increments. Present financial support at both levels, therefore, ought to increase by at least the same amount in order to assure successful recruitment efforts.

"If we argue that the present shares of graduate student support among the government, universities, and foundations should be continued, each should go up steadily to reach a level between 2 1/2 to 3 times the amounts now provided. (Assuming costs remain about the same, of course--you may wish to add 2.5% per year for the normal long-run inflation; that is, at least another 25% by 10 years from now.)"

Conclusion: When the above projection and cost estimates for the growth of the field over the next ten years are set against the leveling-off during the last three years of aid to graduate students by the government and foundations, a critical aspect of the funding problem is brought into focus. The projected needs of the field for a larger faculty will not be met by a continuation of the present levels of aid to graduate students. Unless the universities, together with the government and foundations, are able to double or triple their funds for this purpose over the next decade, the rate of growth and the quality of Japanese studies in our universities will be diminished by a deficiency of trained teachers.

APPENDIX 7a

Meeting of Political Scientists Specializing
in the Japanese Field

New York City, October 24-25, 1968

I. INTRODUCTION

This is a summary of the proceedings of a meeting of thirty-two political scientists specializing in the Japanese field held in New York City at the offices of the Social Science Research Council on 24-25 October, 1968. The meeting was the first of a number of similar disciplinary survey conferences planned by the SSRC-ACLS Joint Committee on Japanese Studies to determine the status, prospects, foci of interest, and professional needs of scholars specializing in Japanese studies. The political science meeting was organized by Robert E. Ward of the University of Michigan with the help of a sub-committee selected on the occasion of the 1968 meeting of the Association for Asian Studies at Philadelphia.

The Sub-Committee first attempted to compile a list of all identifiable political scientists specializing in the Japanese field at universities, colleges, research organizations, and governmental or other professional posts throughout the country. We came up with some eighty-nine names. Working from this we then selected 32 individuals on as representative a basis as possible and invited them to participate in the New York meeting. The 32 were drawn from four national scholarly communities (the United States, Japan, Canada, and Australia), twenty-four different universities, the Social Science Research Council, the Japan Society of New York, the American Universities Field Staff, the Department of State, the Library of Congress, and the RAND Corporation. A list of participants is appended to this report. We would like to have included a larger proportion of those on the master list, but budgetary limitations made this impossible.

An attempt was made to focus discussion at the four sessions of the conference on the following themes and subjects:

1. Research

- a) An examination of the extent of convergence or divergence in approaches to and subjects of research in the several scholarly communities represented at the meeting, especially those of the United States and Japan.
- b) A canvass of areas of neglect and need from a research standpoint.
- c) A discussion of the extent to which current research in our field makes or promises contribu-

tions of larger theoretical and methodological significance.

- d) A consideration of means of increasing research potential in the field through devices such as improved communications, the planning and conduct of research on a more cooperative basis both within the country and with Japanese and other foreign scholars, data sharing, etc.

2. Teaching -- The attempt here was to develop and discuss some basic information with respect to whom we teach, in what numbers, at what levels, in what formats, and with what results of professional consequence. The discussion was based upon a preliminary analysis of the results of a questionnaire circulated by Dr. John M. Maki of the University of Massachusetts to individuals on the master list thought to have current teaching responsibilities.

3. Professional Problems -- A consideration of where we stand with respect to such professional matters as recruitment, training, placement, and specialized needs of a variety of sorts.

It was, of course, not felt that we could in the course of a two-day meeting come up with definitive answers to any of these questions but we did hope to encourage individuals in the field to start thinking about our common problems in a more organized, focussed, and cooperative way than has been attempted in the past and at the same time to make a significant start on compiling the basic information about the status, needs, and potentialities of the field that is so badly needed.

The discussions were based upon the following four research papers and a questionnaire that had been commissioned and circulated in advance of the meetings.

1. "The Present Condition of Japanese Political Studies," Masumi Junnosuke, Tokyo Metropolitan University.
2. "The Study of Japanese Politics: What Has to be Done?" William E. Steslicke, Columbia University.
3. "The Study of International Politics in Japan," Mushakoji Kinhide, Sophia University.
4. "American Scholarship and Japanese International Politics," Donald C. Hellmann, University of Washington.
5. "Survey of American Undergraduate and Graduate Teaching in the Field of Japanese Government and Politics," John M. Maki, University of Massachusetts.

II. SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

A. Research

175

Convergence or Divergence: One of the principal concerns

of the conference was the extent to which the approaches and substance of research in this segment of the American and Japanese scholarly communities display a tendency to converge or diverge. The authors of the four position papers about which the first two sessions of the conference were organized were asked to pay attention to this matter. From these papers and the ensuing discussion a number of points of interest emerged.

While the behavioral approach has been adopted by some Japanese political scientists, the process has been slow, confined largely to younger scholars trained at least in part abroad, and restricted primarily to the study of electoral attitudes and behavior. Still it has achieved a foothold in Japan and will probably continue to develop. In the United States there has similarly been resistance on the part of many political scientists trained as Japanese area specialists to the adoption of behavioral theories and methods. Over the last five to ten years, however, as the newer approaches have been gradually incorporated into the discipline and into the major graduate schools and as their potentialities and limitations have come to be better understood, this resistance has steadily diminished. The situation still varies rather widely among the major graduate schools, but at an increasing number it is either probable or required that doctoral candidates specializing in the Japanese field take a substantial amount of work of a statistical and behavioral sort. While it would obviously be excessive to claim that behavioralism is the dominant research mode in the field, it is encountered far more commonly today than a few years ago and commands the allegiance of an important and growing number of American specialists in Japanese politics, especially among the younger generations of scholars. The tendency in the American community of specialists in Japanese politics to adopt behavioral theories and methodologies in part or in whole is, consequently, considerably stronger than that displayed by their Japanese counterparts. It also seems probable that this trend will continue to develop at a more rapid rate in the United States than in Japan. On this score, therefore, one finds a considerable divergence between Japanese and American research approaches--a degree of divergence, incidentally, which does not appear to characterize equally such areas as economics or sociology.

Divergences between the two national scholarly communities are not limited, however, to this particular issue of the behavioral approach. It would be grossly misleading to overlook other equally important areas of professional divergence. It would be possible to describe these from either an American or a Japanese viewpoint, but it happens that at the conference much of the discussion focused on differences described in terms of prevailing Japanese practices or attitudes. It was rather widely agreed by both Japanese and other participants that Japanese research on political subjects tends to be characterized by the following qualities:

- 1) a preoccupation with historical causation and explanation;
- 2) a marked concern with the ideological, class, and group dimensions of politics;
- 3) a propensity for descriptive rather than theory-oriented approaches to the subject of Japanese politics;
- 4) a preference for legal and institutional research projects frequently of an historical rather than contemporary nature and, related to this in an instrumental sense;
- 5) a rather pessimistic view of the feasibility and fruitfulness of interviewing methods as a means of acquiring reliable information about recent or current political practices and issues and a resultant preference for documentary techniques of research.

None of these qualities was necessarily perceived as lacking in value or justification; in fact, a quite interesting case was made by several American as well as Japanese participants to the effect that a research tradition of this sort represents a very useful complement to the somewhat different preoccupations of American specialists in the field. It is obvious, however, that a similar summation of the prevailing characteristics of research on Japanese politics by American specialists would in all categories show an appreciable and probably increasing difference in central tendency, while in several categories the direction of change would differ by 180 degrees.

Lest it be thought that American professional practice escaped unscathed from these discussions, it should be noted that Professor Steslicke's paper, supplemented by a number of contributions from the floor, provided a most vigorous and detailed indictment of prevailing research practices among students of Japanese politics in this country. The bill of particulars ranged from an implicit ideological and ethnocentric bias (perhaps due in part to governmental and foundation influences) and a lack of theoretical relevance to a challenging list of unacknowledged assumptions said to underlie much of our writing on Japanese politics and a charge that the profession lacks overt and invigorating professional conflict.

This discussion of divergences in the basic approaches to their subject on the part of Japanese and American scholars led to the posing of a question as to what should be the division of labor between Japanese students of Japanese politics and their American counterparts. The answers volunteered ranged from the rather despondent view that the American contribution so far had lain largely in the provision of hypotheses which when tested against the Japanese political scene proved to be largely inapplicable to the quite positive view shared by some of the Japanese as well as some of the American participants that our work had added an important dimension

hitherto lacking in Japanese scholarship and that it was of very considerable value from a Japanese as well as an outsider's standpoint. In more practical terms there seemed to be a good deal of agreement from all quarters that a more collaborative approach was probably the best solution to our common research problems.

Neglected Areas: A second major concern of the conference was the identification of neglected areas where research is concerned. The papers and the discussion provided a rather extensive but--in view of the above-described professional divergences and the quite small number of American researchers involved--hardly surprising list. Many saw entire subfields such as international relations and the study of Japanese politics in explicitly comparative contexts as almost completely undeveloped both in Japan and--to a somewhat less serious degree--in the United States as well. In the case of international relations criticism focused particularly on the failure to incorporate any very significant amount of general theory or comparison into the scant corpus of what writing has been done on a more than policy- or crisis-oriented basis. It was also generally agreed that we badly needed for both academic and policy reasons more attempts to analyze Japanese foreign policies and options within a framework of Asian or Pacific regionalism as well as within that of the general international community. Others mentioned the lack of either case or general studies of the foreign policy decision-making system in Japan and a comparable lack where studies of the nature and consequences of Japanese nationalism are concerned. These last were subjects of particular interest from a policy standpoint to the participants from the Department of State.

In the case of comparative studies involving Japanese politics, quite a few participants called for attempts at what were termed middle-range comparisons with the caveat that we as yet lack in the Japanese case much of the substantive knowledge of the actual functioning of entire areas of major importance to such comparisons, for example, of the legislative process, the budgetary process, the bureaucracy, political socialization, or leadership recruitment and selection. Obviously a good deal of spade work remains to be done in such fields before any very ambitious efforts at cross-national comparisons are feasible. While this was recognized, there was still a sentiment that even in the early stages it is wise to frame and conduct such inquiries in the light of as much comparative experience as can reasonably be brought to bear.

Numerous other research gaps were also mentioned or discussed. These included areas such as political culture, the politics of social welfare and social security, urban politics and problems, the administrative system in general, political violence, such interest groups as the students and intellectuals, and detailed biographical studies of particular contemporary political figures of major importance. One of the

strongest pleas was for far greater attention to political leadership in Japan as the most seriously neglected area and one that contains a great deal of promise in terms of organizing concepts of major importance both for substantive and theoretical progress in our understanding of Japanese politics and in our ability to compare these findings to what is known about similar phenomena in other political systems.

This particular plea was coupled with the view that, relatively speaking at least, some aspects of Japanese politics may well have claimed too much scholarly attention. Among these might be noted studies of factionalism in Japanese political parties, left-wing parties in general, episodic accounts of particular crises or policies in Japanese domestic or foreign politics and, according to some but not others, studies of political modernization.

With respect to completed and published research by Americans on Japanese politics, since there have been relatively few researchers in the field compared with the more popular fields of political science endeavor, very few participants were really, on balance, surprised or apologetic about either the amount or the quality of what has been done. Given the small number involved, it is not surprising that many topics have scarcely been touched as yet, let alone considered from a variety of theoretical perspectives. Indeed, there was a fairly general feeling that research in the field of Japanese politics has by any realistic standards been high in quality and progressive in tendency, especially if compared to the research output in other area fields. A sense of professional pride and accomplishment was manifest in this respect, qualified by a clear awareness of gaps, shortcomings, and unmet needs.

Theoretical Relevance: A third area of discussion focused upon the question of the theoretical relevance of current research in the field of Japanese politics and the problem of what has been called "the area box." This theme cropped up at numerous points throughout the meeting and in so many guises that it is difficult to pull the comments together. It seemed to be rather generally accepted that, while area specialists in general may have lagged considerably behind the political science profession in general in adopting the newer and more theoretically oriented approaches, there have been quite notable changes in this respect among American students of Japanese politics, particularly within the last eight years.

One general and two specific factors seemed to have been largely responsible for this development. The general and most basic factor has been the changing character of instruction and requirements at the better graduate schools. While there are still important differences by schools in the programs leading to the doctorate with specialization in Japanese politics, it is becoming steadily more difficult to qualify

for the degree without substantial exposure to the methods and theories of central importance to the discipline of political science. Consequently there is a growing tendency for the younger members of the profession to become more political scientists with an added interest and competence in the Japanese field than Japan area specialists who have elected to specialize along political lines.

The two specific factors seem to have been the growth of widespread interest since about 1960 in the political modernization of Japan and the concurrent interest taken by numerous specialists in Japanese politics in a general revitalization of theory and method in the subfield of comparative politics since approximately the same date. Both developments have served to inject into the Japanese field a degree of concern for issues of theory and method in the contemporary sense that were either largely absent or slighted at earlier times.

The discussions evidenced a quite understandable desire to continue to move forward from this starting point. There was in some quarters a sense that modernization has about been played out as an organizing concept in the field of Japanese politics. Others were of the opinion that we stand only in mid-course in this endeavor and that it should continue to be one of our central concerns. There seemed to be a general commitment to the comparative approach as essential to the progress of the discipline. A good deal of interest was expressed in cross-national comparisons involving Japan, while several also mentioned the largely unexploited possibilities of internal comparisons of the political process within Japan at several different stages of historical development, for example, in the late 1920's, the occupation period, and today. It was in this context also that the concern for middle-range comparisons described earlier was voiced. The further point was made that while all of the foregoing is fine and represents an undoubted improvement, it still lacks a critical factor--the testing of explicitly formulated hypotheses--and that this should be present in all research worthy of the name.

It was interesting to note that, although there was obviously a general interest in the application of the newer theories and methods to the study of Japanese politics, the commitment involved was in some respects cautious and limited. There was small inclination to throw overboard some of the older interests and approaches in the course of adopting the new. This applied with particular force to the question of the relationship of historical research to the elucidation of problems of interest to political scientists. It was obvious that many of those present felt that the behavioral approach--at least in practice--tended to have serious flaws which led it to underestimate the social science values of historical research. Despite such specific criticisms, there was also evident a very general interest and intent to apply behavioral approaches to research in Japanese politics, mingled with a

feeling that, in such an endeavor to improve our own field, it should be possible to avoid repeating all the mistakes that the behaviorists have made in their attempts to develop this particular approach to the study of politics.

Increasing Research Potential: Finally, in the discussions relating to research there was a consideration of ways in which the research potential of scholars working in the field of Japanese politics might be increased. One of the points made most emphatically related to what seemed to be a widely felt need for more up-to-date and adequate information about who is working on what problems in Japanese politics and related fields in the United States, Japan, and elsewhere. A number of quite telling examples were cited to demonstrate the extent and seriousness of the information gap in this respect, especially since the demise of the Department of State's External Research Office bibliography of ongoing research. The two most promising suggestions for the alleviation of this problem involved a more systematic use of the Japan columns of the Association for Asian Studies Newsletter and the possibility that the Japan Society of New York might be in a position to help out along these lines.

It was also pointed out that research potential might be increased by an improved flow of detailed and current information about Japanese politics. It was generally agreed that the coverage in the American press was deplorably inadequate and frequently trivial and misinformed. It was pointed out that one very usable source was the U.S. Embassy Press and Magazine Translations and that these would be even more helpful if their coverage could be broadened and the quality of translation improved. A more serious difficulty is presented, however, by the limited number of copies of these translations that the Department is able to make available to the scholarly community. Mr. Sneider explained the problems that confront the Department in this respect and said that efforts were now being made to improve both the quality and the availability of these series. Possible solutions include distribution by the Department of Commerce, commercial publication, or support by a consortium of users in this country and abroad.

There was a good deal of discussion also about the potentialities of more cooperative forms of research, particularly those involving joint research between Japanese and American scholars. The Japanese participants all welcomed, and indeed urged, cooperation of this sort but added several qualifications that merit notice. They advised, first, that such research should be truly collaborative and based upon a real equality of status in scholarly participation. They also indicated that in their opinion joint ventures of this sort were most satisfactory if organized along multi-national rather than just bi-national United States-Japan lines. It was apparent, however, that the basic problem for all parties in such collaborative undertakings is more one of finance than of

personnel, status, or organization. The group had no ready answers to this.

The meeting also devoted some time to a discussion of the feasibility of establishing, preferably both in Japan and this country, data banks or archives for Japanese materials of political interest. The results were discouraging in a short-term sense at least. Japanese data of this sort are in some instances highly ephemeral. Many public opinion polling agencies, for example, routinely destroy their materials six months after the survey date. Others regard them as private and of commercial value and are reluctant to make them available for scholarly use. The practice of cooperation across institutional and public-private sector lines has also not been well established in Japan, nor is there strong interest in the development of such an archive on the part of many senior Japanese scholars. Finally, such a project would be costly and no funds are in sight. The only bright spots emerging in this otherwise gloomy picture were, first, the fact that some American data-gathering agencies have in a modest way been collecting and "banking" Japanese data for several years and, second, a desire--embarrassed by a lack of funds--on the part of Sophia University in Tokyo at least to make a beginning on such a project, perhaps through putting on tape the data contained in the recent Sengo Nijūnenshi.

A final facet of this discussion worth noting is the desire expressed by one participant for an amelioration of the professional climate in which behaviorally trained or interested younger Japanese scholars were obliged to operate in their own country. He had in mind what he claimed to be a prevailing and exclusive commitment on the part of senior Japanese political scientists to other approaches and an alleged inhospitality of the professional scene to innovations of this sort.

B. Teaching

The session devoted to teaching was largely expository and centered about Dr. John M. Maki's analysis of preliminary and partial returns from a questionnaire he had circulated at the Subcommittee's request to fifty-eight political scientists specializing in the Japanese field who were known to be actively engaged in teaching. By the time of the meeting only thirty-two responses had been received, of which twenty-seven were found to be in usable form. The results are, therefore, based on partial and inconclusive evidence and should be regarded as distinctly tentative.

The twenty-seven usable responses represented a scatter of institutions ranging from small liberal arts colleges to major state and private universities. Several major institutions were missing, however. The respondents ranged from instructors or lecturers in their first year of teaching to full pro-

fessors with twenty years of experience.

The twenty-seven respondents among them teach only sixteen undergraduate courses devoted exclusively to Japanese politics. They also teach, however, an additional twenty-five undergraduate courses in comparative politics in which substantial attention is paid to Japan. Beyond this, the survey discovered an additional six undergraduate courses devoted either to Asia in general or Japan in general, wherein a fair amount of time is allotted to Japanese government and politics. There were also upwards of twenty graduate seminars relating to Japanese politics, about half of which seemed to be exclusively devoted to this subject. Average enrollments in undergraduate courses are about thirty, with a range of ten to three hundred. In seminars it averages five to ten. In all cases surveyed the courses appeared to be taught by competent specialists trained in the field.

Given so small a sample, it is difficult to come up with any very persuasive generalizations about undergraduate course organization and content. There seems in fact to be considerable diversity. A small plurality of the respondents use a conventional topical approach. Another group has organized courses about the concept of political development. Still others use systems theory and include instruction on the use of computers for the analysis of political data. Apparently audio-visual materials are not widely used. There was quite general criticism of the textbook situation. No one--including virtually all the authors of the texts concerned--was satisfied with the available literature. There was a particularly strong plea from more monographic studies that could be assigned as secondary readings in the field. This was supplemented by desire for more and more readily available translations of Japanese-language materials.

The data on the production of successful doctoral candidates was obviously quite seriously incomplete. They failed to include several major centers of such training. Still the figures available are rather surprisingly low. Thirty respondents to this question had produced among them only thirty-six successful doctoral candidates, and of those thirty-six about half were attributable to two of the respondents. Most of the replies indicated that they felt there was a shortage of available specialists with the doctorate in the field. No one had had any serious difficulty in placing his doctoral candidates.

Dr. Maki concluded his survey with the observation that a survey of this sort specifically directed at specialists in the field of Japanese politics obviously fails to tap a probably quite appreciable and relevant sector. This consists of teachers of courses in comparative or international politics or other discipline-oriented subjects who treat the Japanese among other cases and the group of self-taught teachers at

smaller universities, colleges, and junior colleges who give courses on Japan or East Asia. He concluded, therefore, that these preliminary data not only do not yet adequately represent the teaching situation in the institutions providing specialized work in the field of Japanese politics but they also probably understate considerably the total number of teachers, students, and courses in this field throughout the country at large. He supported this conclusion with some observations about the volume of sales of the five or six currently available texts on Japanese government and politics.

C. Professional Problems

It was interesting to observe the unanimity with which the session on professional problems accorded prime place to language training. The problem is, of course, perennial and obviously appreciable progress has been made, thanks in considerable part to foundation and government support. Still the concerns expressed were many and serious. A number focused upon the question of the sheer time involved in acquiring a satisfactory command of spoken and written Japanese and how this could best be accommodated in a graduate career increasingly beset by mounting and completely valid demands from the disciplinary side. Where elementary language training, i.e., the equivalent of the first three years of normal or the first three semesters of intensive work, is concerned, this led to a useful and, in general, hopeful discussion of the results of the intensive language year presided over by Professor Miwa at the University of Washington, in the course of which the student takes nothing but Japanese, and of the language program designed for its officers by the Department of State after a good deal of experimentation. There were also encouraging reports of the English experience at Sheffield and the Australian plans at Perth for intensive language work. One member of the group also proposed the establishment of a central Japanese language training institute in this country for graduate students specializing in any branch of Japanese studies and spoke highly of the academic benefits to be gained by an intensive, specialized, and large-scale venture of this sort.

Where advanced language training is concerned there was a consensus that this could be done effectively only in Japan and a feeling that the further development of the present Inter-University Center for Japanese Studies in Tokyo offered our best hope for further progress in this area.

Concern was also expressed about the circumstances of students at smaller universities that cannot themselves afford an elaborate and costly program of language training. In this case there were suggestions that the so-called Princeton Plan which provides an academic year and two summers of intensive language work at Princeton for such individuals might well be worth further development and expansion on a regional basis.

The other aspect of the language problem that was discussed at some length was the desirability of pushing the language training element as far back as possible into the undergraduate and even the high school curricula with the hope that a higher proportion of our recruits would enter graduate school with a significant amount of language training already behind them. The group noted with interest the experiment being conducted in the Boston area of taking juniors in high school who have displayed a marked aptitude for language, giving them an intensive 9-week summer course in Japanese, and subsequently encouraging them to continue their study during their undergraduate careers in college.

During this session and throughout the meeting there was also a continuing interest and concern expressed about the political science element in the training of our graduate students. This has been alluded to at several earlier points in different contexts. Suffice it to say here that there seemed to be general agreement that we should be engaged primarily in training political scientists and secondarily in conferring an added area competence. While this is still not uniformly the case in practice, there was little doubt that the profession was in principle already clearly committed to this approach. There was a good deal of anxiety expressed, however, over the practical connotations of such a commitment. It takes substantially more time, support, and effort to produce an "ambidextrous" scholar of this sort than it does a straight disciplinary PhD. There was obviously widespread uncertainty and concern among the group as to how such an operation was to be organized and financed in the future.

The participants were also asked to suggest themes for one of the forthcoming series of Conferences on Modern Japan which, while interdisciplinary in nature, might also have a political bent or focus if a suitable subject is forthcoming. A large number of proposals was elicited including the following: the "managed" economy in Japan and its political implications; a study of the utility of the structural-functional approach to Japan; political leadership in Japan; a comparative study of student activism and the university in the United States and Japan; Japan in 2000 A.D.; nationalism and modernization in Japan; national decision-making in Japan; a comparative study of Japan in the militarist period and contemporary Israel; mass society and politics in the United States and Japan; Japanese and American mutual images of their future roles in Asia and the Pacific; the political consequences of rapid economic change; Japan's image of the United States, past and future; a comparative study of national bureaucracies; model and theory building with respect to problems of urbanization in Japan; a comparative study of the political socialization of U.S. and Japanese students; and a study of political change in post-World War II in Japan.

At the end of this final session the group considered sev-

eral organizational and administrative matters. It recommended the continuance of the Sub-Committee that had arranged this meeting with the addition of Dr. Nathaniel B. Thayer of the Japan Society of New York to its membership. It also endorsed a proposal that arrangements be made for a luncheon or dinner meeting of specialists in Japanese politics in connection with the next meeting of the Association for Asian Studies. It had been agreed previously that efforts should also be made to make more efficient use of the AAS Newsletter as a means of providing information about ongoing research or research plans.

7a: ANNEX A

Political Science Sub-Committee

Hans Baerwald, University of California (Los Angeles)
 Ardath Burks, Rutgers University
 Lee Farnsworth, Brigham Young University
 Donald Hellman, University of Washington
 Michael Leiserson, University of California (Berkeley)
 John M. Maki, University of Massachusetts
 Nathaniel Thayer, Japan Society of New York
 Robert E. Ward, University of Michigan (Chairman)

7a: ANNEX B

List of Participants

Hans Baerwald, University of California (Los Angeles)
 Lawrence Beer, University of Colorado
 Ardath Burks, Rutgers University
 Allan B. Cole, Tufts University
 Lee Farnsworth, Brigham Young University
 John M. Farrior, Department of State
 Haruhiro Fukui, University of California (Santa Barbara)
 Donald Hellmann, University of Washington
 Dan F. Henderson, Harvard University
 Yasumasa Kuroda, University of Hawaii
 Frank Langdon, University of British Columbia
 Paul F. Langer, RAND Corporation
 Michael Leiserson, University of California (Berkeley)
 Roy Lockheimer, American Universities Field Staff
 John Maki, University of Massachusetts
 Theodore McNelly, University of Maryland
 Junnosuke Masumi, Tokyo Metropolitan University
 Douglas Mendel, University of Wisconsin
 Kinhide Mushakoji, Sophia University
 Bradley Richardson, Ohio State University
 David Sissons, Australian National University

Richard L. Sneider, Department of State
 James Soukup, University of Texas
 Kurt Steiner, Stanford University
 William Steslicke, Columbia University
 Nathaniel Thayer, Japan Society
 David Titus, Wesleyan University
 Warren Tsuneishi, Library of Congress
 Robert E. Ward, University of Michigan
 Martin E. Weinstein, Columbia University
 Bryce Wood, Social Science Research Council
 Chitoshi Yanaga, Yale University

7a: ANNEX C

Informal Report on Survey of American Undergraduate and Graduate Teaching in the Field of Japanese Government and Politics

(Note: The survey was conducted during the fall of 1968 on behalf of the Political Science Sub-Committee of the SSRC-ACLS Joint Committee on Japanese Studies. A preliminary report was made to an October meeting sponsored by the sub-committee. This final informal report was prepared by John M. Maki of the University of Massachusetts.)

A. Factual Summary of the Returns

A questionnaire entitled "Survey of American Undergraduate and Graduate Teaching in the Field of Japanese Government and Politics" was circulated to 58 political scientists in the field who have academic affiliations and are probably engaged in teaching. These 58 were culled from an original list of 86 political scientists specializing in the Japanese field, the remaining 28 following non-academic careers. Thirty-nine responses were received of which 34 provided sufficient material for use in this report. Among the 19 not responding were three at the same institution as respondents.

The respondents ranged from instructors or lecturers in their first year of teaching to full professors with approximately 20 years of teaching experience. The institutions represented ranged from major state and Ivy League universities with leading centers of Asian/Japanese studies to small liberal arts colleges.

The 34 respondents among them teach only 20 undergraduate courses which are devoted exclusively to Japanese government and politics. They teach an additional 29 courses in comparative government or comparative politics of Asia in which substantial attention is paid to Japan. In addition, there are another 11, five general courses on Asia and six on Japan, in which some attention is paid to Japanese government and poli-

tics. Of the approximately 36 graduate seminars offered, around half seem to be devoted exclusively to Japanese government or politics or foreign policy. It is reassuring to note that most of the courses reported were being taught either in political science departments or in combined history and government departments.

The most frequent estimate of class size in undergraduate courses is 30. The lowest is around 10 and the highest is around 300 in a course in which Japan is given a fair amount of attention when the respondent teaches it. The most frequent estimate of class size for graduate seminars is 5 to 10. Almost all courses are given once a year. In one case the courses are offered each semester and in another on an alternate-year basis.

Neither prerequisite nor requirement seems to play a significant role in determining class size. Prerequisites, where they are mentioned, are standard, i.e., "the introductory course in political science" or some more specific statement which would seem to apply equally to any non-introductory course in comparative government or politics. In only one case is it stated that students are required to take a course in the field of comparative politics, in which the Japan section is emphasized.

Generalizations:

It is useful to list a series of obvious generalizations that can be drawn from the above material.

1. A total of 86 political scientists specializing on Japan of whom about 60 have academic affiliations represents a shockingly small percentage of the total population of political scientists as judged simply by the thickness (612 double-column pages) of the 1968 Biographical Directory of the American Political Science Association.

2. A comparable degree of shock is produced by the total of only 20 reported courses dealing only with Japanese government and politics. The estimate of class size is also no source of satisfaction. However, I shall return in the final section of this survey to the problem of class number and student population because it is possible that these figures may be seriously distorted downward.

3. The returns do provide grounds for modest optimism regarding the overall state of the field. The wide variety of institutions at which the courses are taught indicates an absence of what might be termed institutional hostility or institutional specialization in the field. The teachers without exception are trained political scientists. The courses are in good hands. There is no reported evidence of discrimination against the courses by the device of prerequisites.

B. Content of Undergraduate Courses and Graduate Seminars

With only the small sample of 20 to draw from, it is difficult to make any generalizations about the content of the undergraduate courses. It is obvious that each teacher simply teaches what he wants to teach in the way he wants to teach it --a highly desirable situation.

A small plurality teach the course from a conventional, topical approach. Apart from this group, perhaps the best way to deal with course content is simply to list a few descriptions as set forth by respondents: "configurational and non-comparative"; "how evolving socio-political attitudes manifest themselves in socio-political behavior"; "the building of theories of politics" by using Japan as a primary source of data; "a comparative approach using institutional similarities with Western democracies, but the different ways these institutions work in the Japanese setting"; and "comparative socio-political attitudes and behavior."

Another small group indicates that its approach is either political development or modernization as exemplified by the Japanese example.

In spite of the current emphasis on it in the discipline, computer analysis is little used in this field.

As might be expected, among the few who do use computer analysis there is strong support for it, some stating that a command of the technique is essential, particularly for graduate students.

It is impossible to make any useful statement about the apparent content of graduate seminars. This is as it should be if the traditional aims of the seminar are still valid: to provide a close intellectual interaction among the seminar members in general and to encourage its individual members to sharpen their tools of research. The wide variety of seminar titles or descriptions shows clearly that each faculty member is building his seminar around his individual theoretical and/or research interests. This also is as it should be.

Generalizations:

On the basis of my examination of the returns I must conclude that the quality of the content of both graduate and undergraduate courses is undoubtedly something more than merely satisfactory. In the first place, all of the courses reported on in this survey are being taught by academicians in their own field of specialization. This obviously provides the vital ingredient of interest and concern with subject matter which is a sine qua non of good teaching and hence of quality of course content.

Secondly, it is clear that, in general, students on both the undergraduate and the graduate level are being exposed not only to the exotic elements of the Japanese system but, more importantly, are being provided with the theoretical and analytical concepts which make that system understandable in terms of general political phenomena. The concern with political modernization and development, with the more general phenomenon of modernization, with comparative political systems, and with the interaction among social and political phenomena is proof of this point.

Thirdly, even those not in sympathy with what seems to be the narrow topical and descriptive approach in some course syllabi must admit that, given the state of ignorance of all American undergraduates regarding our field, such courses obviously provide them with an organized store of useful factual material that otherwise they would not have had access to.

Finally, the backwardness of the field in approaching computer analysis must be considered a potential weakness. This point is based simply on the layman's observation of the increasingly important role of the computer in all areas of society.

C. Audio-Visual Materials

If we exclude lectures and reading from the field of audio-visual aids to teaching, there seems to be little dependence on AV materials in the courses. Naturally, the few who did use them seem satisfied with their quality.

D. Literature Available for Teaching Use

Virtually all authors of textbooks in the field are included among the respondents. All respondents who commented on the textbook situation found it unsatisfactory. No textbook was singled out for praise; even some authors were highly critical of the general textbook situation. The most forthright statement was: "There is absolutely no good text on Japanese government at all, in my opinion. They have no scientific/methodological orientation, and largely ignore (or only poorly include) the great amount of Japanese work available, especially in the area of survey research and psychological testing."

In striking contrast is the heavy emphasis on the necessity for building up the monographic literature in the field. A partial list of suggested topics needing attention includes: political biography; case studies of group political behavior; the role of the Foreign Ministry and the Ministry of International Trade and Industry in the regulation of the economy; the electoral system; bureaucracy and pressure groups; a study of foreign policy; the Liberal Democratic Party; the Prime Minister's Office; decision-making in parties, in the Cabinet

and in the bureaucracy generally; political history (through the Tokugawa period to the present); welfare statism; and a political atlas. Even though there have been some recent excellent articles on some of the above topics, it is possible that the above list constitutes not only an enumeration of the gaps in the monographic literature, but in research in the field.

A small number emphasized the importance of making available more translated materials. Singled out for special emphasis were items dealing with current political developments and the writings of Japanese political scientists. At least two respondents included complimentary references to the Journal of Social and Political Ideas in Japan.

Generalizations:

Although no one identified it as such, it seems clear from the comments that were submitted that the most serious deficiency in the area of teaching of Japanese government and politics is the lack of good monographic material.

This is an extremely difficult problem. Its principal components seem to be: the willingness of publishers to get out the type of standard textbook that is in obvious disfavor in the field; the unwillingness of commercial publishers to handle the type of monograph that has been suggested; the apparent unwillingness of journal editors (but have they ever been tested on this?) to publish the more-than-article-length monograph that seems to be in everyone's mind; and what seems to be the policy of the monograph series of the Association of Asian Studies to avoid titles on contemporary problems.

E. What is Required for the Improvement of the Teaching/Learning Process

The question on this topic elicited a wide variety of responses. Following are a number of suggestions from the respondents: more "serious, reasonably intelligent and strongly motivated students"; the elimination of still lingering Eurocentrism in the discipline of political science; more Japanese professors teaching in this country; more involvement of graduate students in regional and national meetings, perhaps even a graduate student conference on Japanese government and politics; more funds to support travel of American professors to Japan; the learning of two languages thoroughly, Japanese and mathematics; something obviously beyond our control: "a marked improvement in the scholarly quality of the research and writings of Japanese social scientists in Japan"; a broader role for area studies in general education; improved library facilities; and more guest lecturers and exchange professors.

No generalizations can be drawn from that disparate list of suggestions; each can be discussed on its own merits.

F. Doctoral Training

One of the more disturbing statistics to be gleaned from the survey is that approximately 50 doctoral candidates have been trained by about 33 respondents. While this is slightly more than one per respondent, the real point is that about 12 have been trained at the University of Michigan, 12 at the University of California (Berkeley) and 7 at Yale.

Almost all respondents indicated that they would not discourage a good student from entering the field, although several emphasized the importance of bringing home at a very early date the great difficulty of language study. The only exception felt that the China field offered more promise. The same respondent indicated that he felt that we had perhaps approached the saturation point for doctorates in this field. As a matter of fact, all others who commented on this point felt that there was a shortage in the field. The only disagreement, if it can be termed that, concerned the degree of the shortage. Those who commented on the question indicated that they had had no difficulty in placing their successful doctoral candidates.

G. Language Training

Both the number of respondents who mentioned it and the seriousness with which they treated the subject demonstrate that beyond question language training is regarded as the single most important factor influencing the future of the field of Japanese government and politics in this country.

All recognized that language training is absolutely essential for the doctorate. A number of those responding emphasized the importance of trying to get prospective graduate students started on the language while they are still undergraduates. Several referred to the Japanese language programs which have been initiated in high schools in their areas. Two respondents emphasized the development of language training which is appropriate to the field, political science or social science. Still another recommended the development of a "special super-intensive course to develop proficiency in reading."

H. Summary Observations

1. "Hidden" Courses and Students.

This report began with a pessimistic account of the number of courses and the number of students involved in this field. However, the responses to this questionnaire (even if they had been 100 per cent) may provide a misleading picture of the situation.

I base this conclusion on my own experience. Six years ago I added to the list of standard mediocre (see above)

textbooks. Mine has gone through three printings and continues to sell modestly. The early reports on adoptions included a large number of schools which are not represented in this survey and which I would not expect to be. In addition, no respondent is using my book and a cursory examination shows that it only infrequently appears on suggested reading lists. The question is simple: Where are these books going? I ask my fellow textbook writers to check their experiences to see if they match mine.

The following may account for a good deal of hidden courses and students.

a. Comparative government/politics, political modernization/development, etc. courses taught by non-Japan specialists in the Asian field. Just as a number of us deal with China, or the new nations of Southeast Asia, in our general courses, so the reverse must also be true.

b. Perhaps there is also a fair number of self-taught teachers in comparative politics and Asian studies, particularly in small private colleges, who offer courses in the field. The problem is not that of the quality of such teachers or courses. It is simply that they should not be ignored in any comprehensive survey of the total field of teaching in our field.

c. A question that can be answered rather easily (but not here) is this: How does the situation in this field compare with that in other fields of Japanese studies in this country: history, literature, sociology, economics, anthropology and art to mention only the more likely comparisons?

d. A question much more difficult to answer is this: How does the Japanese situation compare with that in other fields: e.g., Chinese government, Soviet government, European comparative government, African government? It is possible that, by comparison, the Japanese field is not as badly off as it may appear to be. But then the even more depressing conclusion would have to be that the teaching of all foreign government/politics courses is in a bad state.

2. Several of the respondents through tangential references brought to light what might be a serious deficiency in the survey. That is the relative weight within the field of graduate Japanese studies of students whose native language was Japanese (obviously, Japanese, Koreans and Taiwanese Chinese). Without this knowledge we cannot get an accurate picture of the graduate teaching field. We are very close, if not past, the point where we shall be getting non-Japanese Asian students with a native command of the language. It is not a sign of nationalistic bias to state that any survey of American graduate studies in the Japanese field must be built around the role of native American graduate students, if for

no other reason than that the critical problem of language-learning by Americans lies at the heart of the problem.

3. In view of the great emphasis placed on the lack of suitable monographs for use in teaching, this problem should be reviewed intensively. The listed suggested topics to be covered should contain items of interest to those who might be "between research papers." Merely being aware of the fact that a future reading public might include not only fellow specialists in the field, but a sizable segment of intelligent human beings who also happen to be undergraduate or graduate students could be a slight but significant additional incentive to embark on a new research project.

As emphasized earlier, the publication problem is a knotty one. Commercial publishers have apparently established to their own satisfaction that there is a market for the standard textbook, as demonstrated by the remarkably high incidence of textbooks-in-print in relation to the number of courses taught. On this basis can it be argued that there is a good likelihood that there would be a reasonable market for modestly priced monographs to be used as supplementary textbooks? If so, is there an adventurous university press that could be argued into taking a flyer in the field?

4. Several respondents mentioned the need for introducing the study of the Japanese language into the high schools. No one mentioned the possibility of a Japanese government/politics section in a "social studies unit." In this regard the following questions may be reasonable:

a. There are accelerated programs in many high schools in the natural sciences and mathematics. Is there any intellectual/pedagogical reason why there shouldn't be similar programs for the social sciences, dealing with such problems as modernization, political development, and socio-political attitudes and behavior?

b. Is there any possibility for weaving Japanese and/or Asian comparative government and politics into the developing Foreign Policy Association program for secondary schools? (What is suggested here is something more basic than such crisis topics as Communist China and Vietnam, as massively important as they are.)

c. Few respondents mentioned Master of Arts programs in the field and those few were at best reserved in their support of them. However, might it not be possible that we can play a subsidiary but nevertheless significant role in M.A.T. programs in the social science field? Might not a strengthening of non-Western social science studies in the high schools and community colleges help to alleviate some of the problems that we presently face in the teaching of undergraduate courses in our field?

APPENDIX 7b

Summary of Proceedings of Conference of Scholars in
Anthropology, Psychology, and Sociology

Rice University, April 11-12, 1969

I. INTRODUCTION

Thirty-seven professional scholars and six advanced graduate students (see Annex A, B) in the fields of cultural and social anthropology, social psychology, and sociology met at Rice University, Houston, on April 11-12, 1969, for a conference on the study of Japan in their disciplines. This conference was one of a series in various scholarly disciplines sponsored by the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies to appraise the entire field of Japanese studies and to attempt to set guidelines for the future. Supplementary funds for the conference were provided through Rice University.

To avoid making the conference into a closed session of specially invited senior scholars, it was decided that invitations to participate as members of the audience and discussants be extended to all scholars in the three fields in question whose work significantly relates to Japan. Personal invitations were sent to all scholars in the United States and Canada whose identities were known to the chairman, and notices of the conference, including an invitation to attend, were placed in the news organs of the Association for Asian Studies and the American Anthropological Association. Participants thus included a number of people who were not authors of conference papers. Within the limits allowed by available funds and scholarly personnel, an attempt was made to have international representation at the conference. Four Japanese scholars, three of whom traveled from Japan for the conference, and one English scholar were included among the participants preparing papers. Most of the professional scholars participating in the conference, 30 persons, were the authors or co-authors of conference papers. Nearly one-third of the conference time was planned exclusively for open discussion.

Original planning of the conference was done by a steering committee composed of Harumi Befu, Richard K. Beardsley, John W. Bennett, George A. DeVos, and Edward Norbeck, chairman. The committee decided to devote the conference principally to an appraisal of research on Japan in the three disciplines in question rather than to focus any substantial part of the time to the subjects of recruitment and training of students; programs and courses of instruction on Japan for students who will not become professional scholars of Japan; and other matters that might be placed under the general heading of re-

sources for the furthering and dissemination of knowledge about Japan. Decision to take this course of action was influenced strongly by lack of personnel willing or able to deal with the neglected subjects and the fact that in two of the disciplines represented, sociology and psychology, the number of scholars is so few that any report on the state of resources, human or other, could be little more than a negative statement of lacks or inadequacies.

II. VALUE OF THE CONFERENCE

The statements that follow represent views expressed by participants verbally and in writing to the chairman, and also observations and opinions of the chairman.

The main objectives of the conference as outlined by the Joint Committee for the entire series of conferences were met with variable degrees of success which in part reflected the emphases of the conference as planned by its steering committee. From the papers and discussions a fairly clear picture emerged of the state of knowledge and of the main foci of scholarly interest, the determining of which were the main aims of the conference. Principal problems were also pointed up although these were not often expressed in quantitative terms. No sharp, detailed, or complete picture emerged of the present state of human resources in the form of scholars, students, and teaching programs. As a by-product of planning the conference, however, an assessment was made of the number of Western scholars of Japan in the behavioral sciences, which appears to be fairly accurate for the United States and Canada, if not for Europe. This hitherto unavailable information, discussed below in Summary of Proceedings, outlines clearly a problem of strong imbalance in the numbers of scholars in the three disciplines.

The conference was also generally regarded as valuable because of the information it conveyed about research on Japan and because of the unique opportunity it afforded for scholars of Japan to meet, talk, and make personal plans for the future. To some participants, the main value of the conference lay in these matters. Most participants felt that they had gained from the conference considerable knowledge, particularly on subjects outside the range of their specific research. As a whole, the conference papers probably constitute the most informative and detailed statement to date on the general subjects of their concern. Many requests for copies of the papers have been received from persons not attending the conference. Plans have been made to try to arrange for publication of the papers in abbreviated form as a book.

To the best of the chairman's knowledge, the conference was the largest assembly to date--and the only large assembly

to date--of American scholars of Japan in the behavioral sciences. Anthropologists, psychologists, and sociologists have thus far not been very active participants in the annual meetings of the Association for Asian Studies, and such sessions on Japan as are conducted at annual meetings of scholarly societies in the three fields have concerned specialized topics and have not drawn a large attendance of colleagues even within a single discipline. For even the oldest hands at Japan studies, the conference provided a chance to meet for the first time scholars in their own and other disciplines. Young scholars and graduate students regarded as especially valuable this opportunity to make personal contacts.

III. SUMMARY OF PROCEEDINGS

A brief summary follows of the proceedings of the conference, organized under four major headings: Resources, Human and Other; Relevance of Research to Theory in the Behavioral Sciences; Problems and Deficiencies; and Considerations for the Future. These categories do not coincide with the groupings of topics at the conference, since most papers focussed on research and dealt only more or less incidentally with resources, problems, and the future. The statements that follow are drawn from both the prepared papers and the discussions among participants.

A. Resources, Human and Other

The number of non-Japanese professional scholars of Japan in the three fields is small and limited principally to citizens of the United States. The analysis which follows is based on a roster of scholars compiled by the chairman. It is probably fairly accurate for the United States and Canada. The roster of English and European scholars is less complete. But even if complete, it would still be very small.

Professional Scholars in the Behavioral Sciences

	<u>United States and Canada</u>	<u>England and Continental Europe</u>	<u>Total</u>
Anthropology	42	1	43
Sociology	19	4	23
Psychology	<u>5</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>5</u>
Total	66	5	71

As the foregoing figures indicate, a large majority of the scholars are anthropologists despite the fact that the number of anthropologists in the United States is much smaller than the number of professionals in either of the other two disci-

plines. In the study of Japan, sociology is poorly represented by professional personnel, and psychology is scarcely represented by non-Japanese scholars. In the United States and Canada, only about a dozen sociologists actively pursue research on Japan, and active researchers in psychology are less than half this number. However, considerable research that has been conducted by anthropologists overlaps with the concerns of sociologists and social psychologists, and some anthropological research is scarcely distinguishable from research in the other two disciplines. The distribution of scholars by discipline appears to reflect the traditional tendency of anthropologists to study exotic cultures and of sociologists and psychologists to study principally their own society.

The distribution by discipline of scholars in Japan differs markedly from the above. (Quantative information on the number of Japanese scholars is not available.) Sociologists far outnumber anthropologists, although Japanese sociologists conduct considerable research on subjects investigated by Western anthropologists. Social psychologists, whose research is strongly oriented toward applied psychology, have become relatively numerous in Japan since the end of World War II.

Information on Japanese and foreign students in training for professional careers in the three fields was not adequately quantified. A preliminary list of advanced graduate students in the United States and Canada, which is probably incomplete, shows a similar weighting toward anthropologists and includes no psychologists. The number of graduate students in England and Europe is assumed to be very small. A few Viennese students who are presently conducting research in Japan or have completed such research recently are described (by Takao Sofue) as well trained in the Japanese language. As with the experienced scholars, the number of Western graduate students is thus small. A "generation gap" exists among present scholars that cannot be compensated for by future students. Most of the presently active scholars are middle-aged persons whose training in the Japanese language and culture began during World War II. Although some young people are now in training, the number of scholars intermediate in age is small.

Resources in the form of programs of training, library holdings, relevant research institutes, and sources of funds to promote training and research were dealt with only sketchily, although a few of the conference papers give explicit attention to information on these subjects that is relevant to the research topics of the papers. On the subject of resources, two themes appeared recurrently--that such resources are scanty or inadequate, and, where sources of heretofore unused or little-used data exist, these are usually archival in nature, located in Japan, and difficult to use for most foreign scholars because they are in the Japanese language. At-

tention was called to the compilations of titles of doctoral dissertations on Japan, such as the one presently being prepared at the Center for Japanese Studies at the University of Michigan. Programs of graduate training in Japan studies that include or allow specialization in the behavioral sciences exist at a number of universities in the United States, but most college and university courses and programs concerning Japan are designed for undergraduates.

B. The State of Research

As the foregoing remarks state or imply, a keynote of the conference in appraisal of the state of research was reiteration of deficiencies. Many conference reports were nevertheless positive statements of progress, and the reports and discussions clearly point to relatively great progress as compared with the circumstances two decades ago. Most research, by both Japanese and non-Japanese scholars, has been conducted after World War II. A number of general statements of other kinds may be made about the conditions of research.

Research by Non-Japanese Scholars

1. Considerable progress has been made in research, but this has heavily emphasized certain subjects, and presents no complete or rounded picture.

The list of topics discussed at the conference represents the major subjects of interest at the present time. These are:

- Sociocultural and economic change (including urbanization
- Personality and Socialization
- Comparative Studies

Subtopics under these major headings have received varying emphases and have increased greatly as time has passed. The heaviest emphasis to date has been on studies of small rural communities, and the orientation of these studies has been essentially ethnographic rather than toward considerations of theory. Kinship has been another major emphasis of study.

Of the three general topics listed above, Sociocultural and Economic Change has been the center of greatest attention, but this attention has been spotty. For the most part, urban Japan and the general topic of urbanization have been the subjects of little research until recently. Other subtopics, such as social problems, religious changes, and motivation toward achievement, have each been the concern of only a very few researchers, and comparative study (comparing data on Japan with data on other societies) has been limited principally to explicit or implicit comparison with the United States. Although included among the conference topics, comparative research on China, the Ryukyus, and the Japanese abroad has been very limited.

2. Most research has been essentially descriptive rather than directed toward the development of theory or toward goals of application to social problems.

Much of the research completed to date consists of the compilation of factual data. Although such research was seen to be necessary and valuable, especially in the beginning stages of study, the general opinion of the participants in the conference was that research to date has tended to neglect matters of theory or interpretation on a cross-cultural level and that research to date has had virtually no importance in the solution of social problems of societies and nations of the world. This deficiency is discussed in greater detail under the heading Relevance of Research..., which follows.

3. Most research has been conducted by anthropologists.

Although anthropologists have often crossed the boundaries of other scholarly fields in their research on Japan, this overweighting toward a single discipline explains some of the emphases and deficiencies.

Research by Japanese Scholars

1. Research has included little independent formulation of theory and has depended principally upon Western-derived theoretical frameworks that are not always well suited to the Japanese circumstances.
2. Most research has concerned topics of small scope and has generally been descriptive.
3. Japanese scholars have a strong tendency to develop exclusive, small in-groups that avoid close contact with other scholarly groups, indigenous or foreign.
4. Japanese research has seldom been comparative.

Like their counterparts in the United States, Japanese scholars have followed trends and emphases in their research, but these trends differ in some ways from the circumstances in the United States, as does the distribution of scholars by discipline. Sociologists outnumber anthropologists, and it is sociologists who have conducted most research on kinship and the social organization of small communities, the two subjects which until recently received the heaviest emphasis. Until recent times, anthropologists were associated with folk ethnology, principally descriptive and its goals bearing little resemblance to the modern behavioral sciences. Until after World War II, sociology was chiefly rural sociology. For some years after World War II, many sociologists concerned themselves with social reform, identifying and inveighing against social institutions they regarded as "feudal" and obsolete. The subjects of sociology today are generally those currently

in vogue in the United States and its theoretical bases are derived chiefly from American sociology. Japanese sociology has shied away from the study of social problems of minority groups or inter-ethnic relations. Social psychology developed only after World War II, shows strong American influence, and after a postwar flurry of Freudian-derived studies of the Japanese personality, has come to emphasize educational and applied psychology.

The tendency of Japanese scholars to form into small, exclusive groups centered on their subjects of interest is described by Japanese participants in the conference as very strong and this tendency is held to inhibit cross-fertilization from other scholarly strains even within the same discipline.

Research by Japanese behavioral scientists has been confined principally to Japan as a matter of personal preference rather than by force of financial circumstances, and little interest has existed among Japanese scholars in comparing data from Japan with circumstances in other societies.

C. Relevance of Research to Theory in the Behavioral Sciences

The consensus of the conference participants was that the history of Japan has a number of characteristics unparalleled elsewhere which make study of the nation and its culture uniquely valuable to the behavioral sciences. These include extremely rapid sociocultural change without any serious domestic upheavals and the fact that many data relating to these changes are available. As an example of remarkably rapid and successful industrialization and modernization, Japan may also be studied advantageously from the standpoint of its relevance to the problems of underdeveloped and developing nations. Despite this great potential value, it was the general opinion that few ideas or theories of general import to the behavioral sciences had been formulated to date by scholars of Japan and that such research of general theoretical import as does exist has made little impact upon the disciplines in question. Cited as examples of research of general relevance were studies and interpretations of kinship, fictive kinship, achievement motivation, and common-interest associations. Speculation as to why published research on Japan had so little currency among professional colleagues not specializing in Japan included the opinion that the research has given too little attention to crosscultural comparisons to allow the formulations of theories and interpretations of general relevance and too little attention toward the application of Japanese data in attempts to solve social problems.

D. Problems and Deficiencies

As previously noted, reference to deficiencies was made frequently, and this was perhaps the most commonly reiterated theme of the conference. Problems and deficiencies that ap-

peared to be regarded as major issues are summarized briefly below. Some of these have already been explicitly stated in other contexts or have been implied. For the most part, no solutions for the problems were proposed or seemed feasible.

1. Lack of Personnel

The number of non-Japanese scholars is small, especially in sociology and psychology. Prospects are poor for a substantial increase in numbers in the near future. In all three fields, only a small number of scholars are at an intermediate level in age and experience, a circumstance which may in the future present problems of shortage of personnel in programs of training. The circumstances among Japanese scholars were not made clear.

2. Lack of Facilities and Funds for Training and Research

Although general opinion seemed to hold that facilities and funds for training and research in the United States were far from ideal, these deficiencies are undoubtedly more acute in Japan. The deficiencies in the United States seem to reflect in part lack of strong demand for such facilities and support.

3. Language Barriers

The difficulty that the Japanese language imposes for speakers of Indo-European languages was expectably cited as a deterrent to research. Problems of Japanese scholars in mastering English were similarly discussed. No solutions were suggested. It is noteworthy, however, that the conference included Japanese whose competence in English is certainly adequate for useful scholarly communication. The stated opinion of one of the Japanese participants (Takao Sofue) is that American behavioral scientists are generally competent in speaking Japanese but not very competent in the written language.

4. Deficiencies in Topical Research

This subject has already been discussed, and may be summarized in the statement that research has progressed but is at best spotty. Particular deficiencies that might be partially met without collecting new data are the lack of comparative studies and of interpretive or theoretically oriented studies.

5. Problems of Collaboration Between Japanese and Non-Japanese Scholars

The exclusiveness of scholarly groups of Japanese as well as problems of linguistic communication inhibit collaborative study by native and foreign scholars, and, it is con-

tended (Chie Nakane and Ken'ichi Tominaga), in Japan especially inhibit the development of scientific theory. No solution to this problem is in sight, but it is encouraging to note that at least some Japanese scholars were collaborating with foreigners at the conference and that a few of the conference papers were prepared by such collaborative effort. It seems certain that, if conference funds had so allowed, many Japanese scholars would have been willing to participate in the conference. It is probable that every American scholar at the conference collaborates with one or more Japanese scholars.

6. Professional Demands that Inhibit Specialization in Japanese Studies

Most American participants in the conference are unable to devote more than a small part of their time and efforts to the study of Japan because of demands placed upon them by their universities for other activities, including the teaching of courses on subjects other than Japan. This state of affairs reflects the relatively small demand for courses on Japan in the behavioral sciences.

Considerations for the Future

As far as expressed ideas indicated, the activities that anthropology, sociology, and psychology might best undertake in the future are not very clear; so also are trends of growth in research and in numbers of research personnel. Few if any participants appeared to have clearly formulated ideas of broad scope on these subjects, perhaps in part because they had not yet acquired any clear overview of the present state of affairs. Various ideas and opinions were expressed, but these were often vague or generalized statements of the desirable that might apply to any program. Most of these ideas can be reduced to two broad and unsurprising recommendations, which do not include clear statements of courses of action to reach the desired goals.

Recommendations of Broad Scope

1. Improvement should be sought in programs of training and facilities for training and research, and action should be taken to encourage the recruitment of personnel, especially in social psychology and sociology. These recommendations involve increased financial support.
2. Serious thought and attention should be given to making the results of research on Japan useful--in promoting the growth of scientific knowledge for its own sake and, in applied form, as an aid in solving social problems and problems of international relations. Opinion was divided on the relative emphasis that might appropriately be given to pure research versus

applied research; both goals were nevertheless regarded as desirable.

A few specific suggestions and recommendations that relate to the foregoing statements also emerged repeatedly:

Specific Recommendations

1. Rapport and collaboration between Western and Japanese scholars should be improved. Primarily obstacles are the social exclusiveness and academic provincialism of Japanese scholars and, for both Japanese and non-Japanese scholars, the barriers of language. A suggested means of improving communication among scholars is the conduct of additional conferences in which participation is truly international. If financial support is provided, willing participation in such conferences seems assured.
2. The scope of comparative research should be enlarged beyond the present general trend of comparing only the United States and Japan, with the ultimate aim of formulating scientific generalizations of universal significance and applicability.

Additional details on the proceedings of the conference, particularly on the contents of papers on research topics, are provided in the discipline by discipline summary prepared by Sue Parman, a graduate student in anthropology at Rice University.

E. General Summaries by Discipline

1. Anthropology

American behavioral scientists who study Japan are mainly anthropologists. Most are only part-time Japanologists because of a shortage of funds, which some believe is due to the prevalence of descriptive research projects which do not supplement general theory, and which do not offer data relevant to America's present concern with large-scale social problems. Western anthropologists began to study Japan 30 years ago with research on small villages. Anthropology has traditionally been associated with the study of small-scale, clearly delineated "culture wholes." Both American and Japanese behavioral scientists have tended to pay more attention to rural than to urban Japan. In Japan, however, the study of the social organization of kinship and community belonged to sociology; anthropology was equated with folk ethnography.

World War II, however, emphasized the status of Japan as a modern nation. The incredible rapidity of Japan's economic and social development has commanded the attention of many social scientists. Some say that if anthropology is to

be useful in the future, it must transcend its traditional focus on small communities and borrow from other disciplines such as economics and political science. Others feel that anthropology's limitations are not due to an emphasis on small communities per se, but to the methodology which is mainly descriptive rather than theoretical. They say that anthropology's major task in the future will be to construct theories by which the "esoteric" descriptions gathered in small communities will have general import for the study of social units of any size and geographical location. For example, how different sectors of Japanese society have adapted to change, and whether the change can be understood as imitation of Western models or as a continuation of pre-existing patterns, are questions which relate to general principles of culture contact, stability and change.

Other anthropological work is needed which replicates and supplements work already done. For example, thorough ecological studies of single villages and regions are absent from the literature, as are studies which document the political, economic, ideological, etc., networks which knit villages and towns and cities into a functioning nation. Within these networks, processes of individuation, and the structure and function of kin relations, class structure, religious and other forms of ideology in an urban-industrial environment, are all appropriate topics for the anthropologist.

Both Japanese and Western anthropologists face various practical problems in their study of Japan. The Japanese language is formidable for Western scholars, and language training in the United States tends to be geared toward reading skills rather than toward speaking ability. Japanese scholars must learn English if they are going to communicate their findings to the scientific world outside Japan. Collaboration between East and West is difficult because of the tendency for Japanese behavioral scientists to form master-disciple relationships with their Western colleagues, and because of what one Japanese scholar calls "the local color of Japanese anthropology." That is, Japanese anthropologists are more committed to research problems specific to Japan, such as the culture origins of the Japanese people, and are not very interested in other cultures; few have studied abroad, and most write only in Japanese. They have committed themselves not to a cosmopolitan world of science, but to a tightly-knit community of Japanese scholars in which personal vertical loyalties even exclude members of other disciplines within Japan. It may be argued that all scholars suffer to greater or lesser extent from parochialism; but the importance of group affiliation is strongly evident in Japanese academic organization, and is antithetical to the development of interdisciplinary and comparative behavioral science.

2. Psychology

Anthropological and psychological work in Japan by

both American and Japanese scholars mushroomed during the first ten years after the war. These studies drew heavily on Freudian psychology, and focused on "pathological" traits of the Japanese to explain their involvement in the war. Social psychology, imported just after the war, has been used in industrial and market research group dynamics, and the study of mass society. Sophisticated forms of attitude and opinion surveys are used primarily by sociologists and statisticians. One aspect of social psychology, the study of "national character," was of great interest to Americans during the war. The Japanese became interested in this approach in a reaction against traditional, "feudal" characteristics in their own society, and most of the work was descriptive rather than analytic; a few researchers are using psychological tests in the attempt to build a systematic description of Japanese character. Works on the "national character" of the Japanese people assume that homogeneous psychological characteristics exist throughout the population. This concept needs to be developed, and will probably give way to a description of the psychological characteristics of different subgroups defined by social class, age, sex, occupation, etc. In the future, comparisons with other societies should reveal the types of psychological adjustment that are common to societies with similar occupational and technological structures.

Throughout these subgroups, however, a major theme is prominent: the importance of the group over the individual. This theme is supported by a variety of emotional and ideological patterns, and has been explored in studies of child socialization, the family, values, and psychiatric illness. For example, the effects of the close relationship between mother and child, especially mother and son, have been explored in the concept of "amae," the need to love. This concept has shed light on forms of mental illness which are common in Japan, characteristics of the normal Japanese adult, group behavior and institutional forms. Another contribution which psychology has made to the study of Japan is the study of an "achievement motivation" that parallels but is different from the Western "Protestant Ethic."

Today, the large number of members in professional societies for educational and applied psychology may reflect the Japanese concern for local problems. One social problem that most Japanese psychologists have tended to shy away from, however, is the problem of prejudice.

Japanese psychologists are often content to replicate American research. However, these studies contain implicit assumptions which may distort Japanese data. Componential analysis, the semantic differential, word association tests, time depth studies of literature, projective tests, and the study of bilinguals, are methods which are being tested and developed for cross-cultural use.

3. Sociology

American sociologists have concentrated their energies on local American problems, and few have contributed to the study of Japan. Ethnocentrism among American sociologists may be just as great a problem as it is claimed to be for Japanese behavioral scientists. They have done some studies in Japan on demography, deviance, social structure, and the family.

Japanese sociology concentrates more heavily than American sociology on demography and statistical sociology, and less heavily on psychoanalysis and symbolic interaction. Studies of stratification and social mobility, relations between village and city, the effects of land reform and industrialization, have developed after World War II. Sociology in Japan has existed about 90 years. During its history, the ideas of different foreign schools (e.g. Marxism, German historical school, American structure-functionalism and conflict theory, etc.) were absorbed, and more sophisticated sociological theory developed. In the 1920's, American rural sociology became central foci for Japanese scholars. Within these sub-fields developed the concepts dōzoku (a hierarchical federation of independent families), fictive kinship, and modern urban derivatives of both of these phenomena in industry, politics, and the underworld.

In America, as in Japan, sociological thought seems to cluster around grand, universalistic theories, or around descriptive data relating only to a particular segment of the population. Both American and Japanese sociologists have yet to develop "theories of the middle range." Comparative work is needed to relate the "universals" to cultural contexts, and to transform trivial data into general principles. Obvious points of comparison between the United States and Japan may be found in mutual problem areas, such as student riots, bureaucratic and race relations, and the effects of urban spread and general economic change.

F. Research Methods and Resources

Research in Japan by American and Japanese behavioral scientists has been increasing over the last 25 years, but funds and training are not readily available. In America before 1945 to the present, less than 100 people have gotten a Ph.D. in one of the behavioral sciences by doing fieldwork in Japan. These "human resources" have then gone on to do other work. The substantial bulk of books and articles written about Japan in the past four years has been written by authors trained in other fields besides anthropology, psychology or sociology.

There are a number of funding institutions (e.g., NSF, SSRC, NIMH, and Fulbright-Hays) that have not been tapped by American behavioral scientists for fieldwork in Japan. In various universities, grants for research and teaching have

gone to other disciplines besides anthropology, psychology and sociology. Asian studies and intensive language training are available at many universities, though many of these programs are geared more toward undergraduate than advanced training, and teaching rather than research is emphasized.

Why have funds and training not been easily available? This is an age in which a strong consciousness of the immediacy of social problems has led financing and teaching institutions to emphasize the "harder" social sciences such as economics and political science. Also, anthropology, psychology and sociology have been criticized for using outmoded theoretical frameworks.

Comparative studies are needed to evolve a theoretical framework that may be applied to all countries. Newsletters which provide information on common issues such as student riots will enable scholars to build generalizations which may then be used to generate research applicable and relevant to all nations. Standardized research techniques must be developed so that research within a nation and across nations can be compared. We should make explicit our implicit comparative baselines. The real world provides variable, complex data which are difficult to compare; the laboratory provides standardized situations in which variables are controlled but behavior tends to be simplified and influenced by the research situation. Both techniques can be used so that they complement each other. Japanese researchers tend to duplicate American studies without treating Japanese culture as a variable. Americans often do not utilize existing studies. Neither group is sufficiently interested in doing follow-up studies to validate previous findings or supplement them.

7b: ANNEX A

List of Participants

Azumi, Koya, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Wisconsin
 Beardsley, Richard K., Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of Michigan
 Befu, Harumi, Dept. of Anthropology, Stanford Univ.
 Bennett, John W., Dept. of Anthropology, Washington Univ.
 Brown, L. Keith, Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of Pittsburgh
 Caudill, William, Laboratory of Socio-Environmental Studies,
 National Institute of Mental Health, Bethesda
 Chang, Kenne H-K., Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of California,
 Davis
 Cole, Robert, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Michigan
 Cornell, John B., Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of Texas
 DeVos, George A., Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of California,
 Berkeley
 Dore, Ronald P., London School of Economics

- *Ebuchi, Kazukimi, Dept. of Education, Fukuoka Kyōiku Univ.
 Fischer, John L., Dept. of Anthropology, Tulane Univ.
 Fischer, Ann K., Dept. of Anthropology, Tulane Univ.
 Frager, Robert, Dept. of Psychology, Univ. of California,
 Berkeley
 Hsu, Francis L. K., Dept. of Anthropology, Northwestern Univ.
 Iga, Mamoru, Dept. of Sociology, San Fernando Valley State
 College
 Ishino, Iwao, Dept. of Anthropology, Michigan State Univ.
 Karsh, Bernard, Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Illinois
 Kiefer, Christie W., Langley Porter Neuro-psychiatric Insti-
 tute, San Francisco
 Lanham, Betty B., Sub-Dept. of Behavioral Sciences, Albany
 Medical College of Union Univ.
 Lebra, William P., Social Sciences Research Institute, Univ.
 of Hawaii
 Marsh, Robert, Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology, Brown Univ.
 Moos, Felix, Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of Kansas
 Nakane, Chie, Institute of Oriental Culture, Univ. of Tokyo
 Nakano, Takashi, Tokyo Univ. of Education
 Niyekawa-Howard, Agnes, Univ. of Hawaii
 Norbeck, Edward, Dept. of Anthropology & Sociology, Rice Univ.
 Passin, Herbert, Dept. of Sociology, Columbia Univ.
 Plath, David W., Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of Illinois
 Sanches, Mary, Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of North Carolina
 Singleton, John, School of Education, Univ. of Pittsburgh
 Smith, Robert J., Dept. of Anthropology, Cornell Univ.
 Sofue, Takao, Meiji Univ.
 Tominaga, Ken'ichi, Tokyo Univ.
 Vogel, Ezra P., Dept. of Social Relations, Harvard Univ.
 Wagatsuma, Hiroshi, Dept. of Anthropology, Univ. of Pittsburgh
 Wimberley, H. Howard, Dept. of Sociology and Anthropology,
 Univ. of Iowa
 *Yoshida, Teigo, Research Institute of Comparative Education
 and Culture, Kyushu Univ.
- *Co-author of conference paper. Not present at conference.

7b: ANNEX C

Japanese Studies in Anthropology, Sociology and
Psychology: Status and Needs of the Field

(Communication by Robert M. Marsh, Brown University)

I attended the Conference on Japan in the Behavioral Sci-
 ences at Rice University on April 11-12, 1969. My comments on
 what I see as the present status and future needs in this area
 are based on the papers written by Conference participants, as
 well as on the exchanges I observed at the Conference. I
 shall strive for objectivity, but this report necessarily
 gives greater emphasis to those aspects which I personally see

as most critical. To support my statements I shall quote from and cite liberally the Conference papers.

I

In principle, the study of Japan is of the utmost importance in the behavioral sciences. In Karsh's words:

Japan offers a magnificent laboratory for developing generalizable propositions regarding social change (and in some important ways, a laboratory which is more manageable than the U. S. context)--[not to mention the other major East Asian society, mainland China (RMM)]--and Japan remains the only case of non-western industrialization and modernization, and we know almost nothing of the implications of that for the contemporary "third world." (p. 10)

It is clear to all Japan behavioral scientists that the potential relevance of Japan to their discipline is far from realized. This report aims to suggest ways in which this situation can be improved.

In contrast to the study of Japan by historians, modern behavioral science work concerning Japan--by Japanese and Westerners--is barely 25-30 years old. Bennett aptly characterizes the topics on which most research has been done by socio-cultural anthropologists:

- (1) studies of kinship, family and other aspects of social relations and special-function social groupings;
- (2) community studies, particularly studies of rural communities...
- (3) psychocultural studies.... (pp. 3-4)

Tominaga (A) agrees:

From early Shōwa times, rural sociology dominated and created an image of sociology as the study of villages, the family and kinship. (p. 17)

This focus has given some depth and continuity to studies in these limited areas. But in today's behavioral science perspectives, this focus is perhaps more striking for what it omits than for what it covers. It is essentially microsocial, as in Bennett's definition:

- (1) studies of communities, special groups, and segments of society;
- (2) studies of particular culture patterns, slices of behavior, and psycholinguistic concepts;
- (3) studies of particular patterns of social relationships and social process. (p. 9)

What has been lacking in behavioral science research on Japan

in the last quarter century is explicit attention to how these individual groupings, slices of behavior and particular cultural patterns fit into the larger society of Japan. In short, a major need is to shift toward macrosocietal analysis of Japan.

A second limitation in behavioral science work on Japan is that it is primarily concerned with contemporary phenomena. It will be suggested below that there needs to be much more attention given by social scientists to the past and to historical social change in Japan.

A third set of limitations can be seen especially in the work of Japanese social scientists. Nakane writes: "I believe that as long as [Japanese] continue to write their papers in Japanese for Japanese, their backwardness in the scientific study of anthropology will continue" (p. 5). Nakane makes a telling contrast between the "visibility" of Indian anthropology outside of India and the relative "invisibility" of Japanese anthropology.

Indian anthropologists maintain very good communication with non-Indian anthropologists, British, American, French, Japanese, or of other nationality. I think this is one of the reasons that Indian anthropology has advanced farther than Japanese anthropology. In fact, anthropological works on India are much read by, and their theoretical concerns are shared with, anthropologists who do not specialize in India, whereas Japanese works on Japan are read by a fairly limited circle interested in Japan rather than in theoretical issues. (p. 6)

This then is the challenge which behavioral scientists of Japan should strive to meet: to put their analyses of Japan in an explicitly theoretical context. By doing this, the work on Japan will become of greater importance to social scientists in general, even though they are not interested in Japan as such.

Tga sounds the same note:

Despite their acquaintance with theories, whether ecological, institutional, social psychological, or on social change, Japanese sociologists do not seem to be inclined to integrate theory with empirical research. (p. 4)

There are other changes that should be introduced in all future work on Japan (and in any future conferences in the behavioral sciences on Japan). First and foremost in my opinion (and Nakane, Befu, Caudill and others agree) is that work concerning Japan should be more explicitly comparative with other societies.

It is my conviction that ethnologists specializing in Japan must have a fairly good comparative knowledge of Chinese society or other societies of Asia.... In Japan the comparative perspective has tended to be neglected in favor of complex interests in the peculiarity of Japanese culture. It is regrettable that foreign anthropologists specializing in Japan, regardless of their national affiliation, are apt to become as parochial as the Japanese. (Nakane, p. 11)

Caudill found the Houston Conference to be focusing too narrowly on the intensive study of Japan rather than on the contribution that could be made by an alternative strategy: "following a set of problems across the cultural boundaries of a series of societies" (pp. 8-9). To illustrate: when a writer on Japan states "the Japanese are achievement-oriented," he is making an implicitly comparative statement: relative to some other society, or to some research instrument's measurement, the Japanese are more achievement-oriented. The question thus becomes: relative to what other societies? relative to what tests or instruments of measurement? Until these questions are treated explicitly, the reader cannot know what the statement means. This is why cross-societal comparative analysis needs to be developed in Japanese behavioral studies.

As we begin to compare Japan more with other societies, it is important, as Caudill notes (p. 31), that these societies include Southeast Asia and Europe, instead of mainly U.S.A.-Japan comparisons. There are interesting sociology of knowledge reasons why Japan is most often compared with the U.S. But in many ways, more meaningful comparisons can be made with nations in other parts of the world, e.g., with rice-producing communities in Southeast Asia, or with post-war industrial organization in Europe.

A second needed change is that Western social scientists studying Japan should make much greater use of work in Japanese. Though this work has the faults already listed, it is nevertheless a largely untapped mine of social and cultural data. The number of Western social scientists who can easily read Japanese may slowly increase. In the short-run, however, a critical need on the part of Western social scientists is to have major articles and monographs selected each year and well translated into English. The Joint Committee should consider this need as high on its list of priorities.

II

Thus far, I have highlighted some general deficiencies in studies of Japan by behavioral scientists, and suggested changes which are so basic that they can influence the entire range of studies in this area. I turn now to more specific

recommendations, again flowing from the Conference papers and my own judgment, on the kinds of research that needs to be done to fill out gaps in the Japan field.

A. Shift From Studies of "Japan-in-the-Small" to Studies of "Japan-in-the-Large"

Historians and political scientists and economists of Japan have always tended to work at the macro- (total society, total economy, total polity) level. As already shown, behavioral scientists have worked mostly on the micro-level, e.g., the buraku. When the latter attempt to link the micro- and macro-levels, they have had almost no alternative but to use the studies of historians, etc. This poses problems of another sort. The analytical and conceptual aspects of historical writing are usually too underdeveloped and cannot easily be translated into behavioral science terms.

Exceptions are few and tend to prove the rule. Thus, Bennett states that the only instance of large-scale team research by foreign social scientists, mounted from abroad--the Michigan Okayama studies--is, after all, still more on the micro- than the macro-level. Beardsley, Hall and Ward's Village Japan

did not really succeed in its aim of providing general knowledge on Japan, because the conceptions guiding the study remained on the whole at the earlier anthropological community-study level. (p. 13)

What is most conspicuously lacking in this field is a theory of the relation of micro- to macrosocial phenomena (Bennett, p. 15). This is so central to future work on Japan that any and all future conferences of behavioral scientists should take it as their fundamental focus.

More specifically, there are two classic macrosocietal studies of Japan: Benedict's Chrysanthemum and the Sword (1946) and Bellah's Tokugawa Religion (1957). There should be translation of the important critiques in Japanese of these works. Then, in the light of these critiques and of recent advances in knowledge, there should be follow-up studies of both books, done at a similarly macrosocial level. However wrong these two books may have been, they boldly analyzed that which most Japan behavioral scientists have avoided: the larger society and culture of Japan as functioning structures.

There are some macrosocietal models of Japan that bear serious consideration: Nakane's "vertical society" model, the "dual society" model, and the structural-functional model of society. With regard to the latter, Tominaga writes that after Takada Yasuma no Japanese formulation of a large-scale theory appeared. Today, the younger Japanese sociologists are beginning to examine Parsons' and Merton's theories as viable alternatives to Marxism. (See Tominaga (A), p. 7.)

B. Socio-Cultural Modernization in Japan

In the past, more emphasis was given to problems of the ethnogenesis of the Japanese people (Nakane, p. 4) and to the historical origins of socio-cultural patterns in Japan, than to a newer perspective of the behavioral sciences: adaptation theory. The question that should figure more prominently in the future is: how do the Japanese, with their social resources, cope with problems that are common to every industrialized society? (Bennett). A very basic difference is involved here. The study of modernization examines problems common to any industrial society--urbanism, increasing mobility, etc., and in this way Japan is viewed as a comparative case, rather than as unique. But at the same time, it is assumed that the particular constellation of social, cultural and personality patterns that made up Japan--referred to above as Japan's "social resources"--gave Japan a somewhat unique way of coping with, adapting to, these common problems. Thus, Japan's uniqueness and its commonness with other industrial societies are brought into juxtaposition. The Dore-edited volume, Aspects of Social Change in Modern Japan, is a step in this newer direction, but much more remains to be done. Again, the research along these lines could be reported either at a single conference, with Japanese adaptations to modernization as its central theme, or at more than one conference, as a partial theme.

C. Interdisciplinary Research on Pre-Industrial Urbanism and Rural Society in Japan

Japanese anthropologists and sociologists (and their Western counterparts) need historical data in order to properly deal with questions of pre-industrial urbanism and rural society. At the same time, historians working on these topics could benefit more than they have from the analytical tools of the social scientists. Nakane's Kinship and Economic Organization is a prime example of the value of integrating the work of historians and the analytical models of social scientists. Koyama Takashi's study of family registries of a community in Kai Province from 1802 to 1861 (Koyama, 1959) is another brilliant step in the right direction. Also worth noting are Mannari Hiroshi's 1964, 1965 and 1966 historical studies of the Japanese business elite. As stated above, Japanese studies in the behavioral sciences, by scholars of whatever nationality, need to become less contemporary, more longitudinal (diachronic). It is regrettable that when social scientists talk about "traditional society" they pay so little attention to the rich historical data relevant to the time periods at which Japan was presumably a case of "traditional society." Yet it is asking perhaps too much of social scientists that they become historians. Therefore, closer collaboration between historians and social scientists is called for.

D. Strain, Protest and Breakdown During Japan's "Modern Century"

In a similar vein, there is need for interdisciplinary collaboration of social scientists of a "behavioral" persuasion and historical and political scholars, on the "seamy side" of Japan's modernization. This is a much-needed corrective for the more common view of smooth transition, continuity and "the cushioning effect of social forms and values on the changes imposed by rapid economic growth" (Cole, p. 9).

We point out the way the ground for successful industrialization was "carefully" prepared in the Tokugawa period. Consequently, we minimize the suffering and dislocation and exploitation which were a part of the rapid economic development. (Cole, p. 9)

The Marxist orientation of many Japanese scholars has, of course, led them to stress protest, conflict and exploitation. Yet we here distinguish between the doctrinaire treatment of these phenomena in Marxism, and the more empirical work of non-Marxist writers. In sociology, the action theory of Parsons, as developed by Eisenstadt, Smelser, and others, provides a scheme for analyzing anxiety, conflict, revolution, etc., in non-Marxist terms. The scheme has already been applied to Britain's industrial revolution and to a number of "developing" nations around the world; it needs to be applied to Japan. Caudill notes the same need in our research on Japan: our studies should deal more with these developments:

...some of the bloom has worn off of being a salaryman: of having one's sweet little home on the edges of Tokyo, Nagoya or Osaka which begins to fall apart after four or five years because it is cheaply constructed; of spending three or four hours each day to get to and from a job that rapidly ceases to have meaning because it does not lead anywhere; of turning to "leisure" to find interest in life along with the hordes of other people who leave the city each week-end.... (Caudill, p. 14)

E. The Sociology of Japanese Industry and Economic Development

Abegglen's The Japanese Factory is widely cited in the West and heatedly debated by Japan specialists. Follow-up studies have long been needed, and now at least four are underway. (1) Karsh and his associates at Illinois seek to compare industrial firms, matched on technology, product and even on specific jobs, in Japan and the U.S. They ask, does similar technology give rise to common social organization in industry, despite cultural-historical differences? (2) A team of British and Japanese scholars--Hideaki Okamoto, Hazama Hiroshi and Keith Thurley--is comparing firms in these two nations. (3) Robert Cole did participant-observation research

in two Japanese factories on the subject of the meaning of work and company attachments of blue collar workers. (4) In 1969-70, Mannari Hiroshi and Robert M. Marsh will conduct comparative studies of several firms in the Osaka-Kobe area to answer questions about the effect of social organization at the factory level upon industrial productivity.

This convergence of studies calls for a future conference, to which some economists should be invited, the purpose of which would be to compare and synthesize findings from the separate studies. For some time now we have needed a more differentiated account of Japanese industry than Abegglen provides. The conference should include at least one paper prepared by a Japanese scholar, summarizing Japanese critiques of Abegglen.

Since the "lifetime commitment" thesis is at the center of the controversy, the research of both sociologists and labor economists on labor mobility should be of extreme importance. (See Tominaga, p. 3.)

Closely related is the need for research on Japan to test convergence theory. This theory--that all highly modernized societies, regardless of historical background, will come to resemble each other in crucial respects--should be regarded as problematic, not as given. Japan specialists can be found at all points along the continuum of acceptance-rejection of convergence theory. Japanese scholars "envision a 'convergence' based on an economic determinism," but not in terms of pluralistic society. Rather, convergence toward socialist society. (See Cole, p. 5, for further sources on this view.)

F. Social Stratification and Mobility in Japan

The study of social mobility is today one of the most important sociological topics...and this study includes some attention to systematization of theories of social class. (Tominaga (A), p. 13)

Stratification and mobility are processes for which sociologists now have powerful tools for analysis at the national (total societal) level. Since a considerable body of data for Japan has been accumulated in this area, it is a major road to the macro-societal studies I have advocated throughout this report. The 1955 national survey of stratification and mobility in Japan was followed every five years by other surveys. Tominaga has designed an explicitly comparative study of mobility in Chicago and Tokyo, as well as introducing recent methods such as path analysis into Japanese mobility studies. A host of problems can be investigated in this area. For example, Tominaga (B), p. 12, reports that there has been a trend in Japan toward reducing income differentials. Since Titmuss and Miller have questioned how far income differentials have been reduced in Britain and the U.S., respectively,

one can ask concerning Japan: will the income differentials continue to decline, or will Japan, too, reach a plateau of stable inequality of income (though less marked than before)?

G. Attitude and Opinion Research in Japan

The first large-scale opinion research in Japan was conducted under the aegis of the occupation. Since then, the regular collection of attitude data from sample surveys has been done by major newspapers and other agencies. Future research should organize, explain and interpret this mass of data on persistence and change in Japanese attitudes. Which variables account for most variation in people's attitudes--age, sex, education, occupation, rural-urban residence, etc.? Here we link up stratification studies and attitude research. This is a central theoretical problem, and behavioral scientists would pay careful attention to work done in this area in Japan, whether or not they are interested in Japan as such. Again, behavioral scientists on Japan would be well advised to collaborate with political scientists and anthropologists in their research (and in any future conferences called by the Joint Committee) on attitudes and opinion. There could be a fruitful interchange here: "public opinion" in the sociological sense is the response of a sample of the population to a given set of questions; in the political science sense it is also tied to policy making of members of the Diet, etc.; in the anthropologists' sense it is the more informal, "inside-dopester" version of what the Japanese told the survey interviewer at the door. What is needed is to mesh these three related aspects of "public opinion" and social attitudes. Again, the neo-nationalism in present-day Japan calls for research by behavioral scientists, to supplement the work of political scientists and economists on these important developments. (See Wagatsuma, pp. 20-22.)

H. Social Psychology and Japanese Personality

The final set of research problems can be variously denoted as social psychology, personality, cross-cultural psychology, and the psychocultural study of Japanese behavior (DeVos, Caudill, Wagatsuma, Frager, Lanham). Illustrations of the kinds of problems Japan specialists have worked on, and are likely to explore further, follow.

What are the effects of vertical structure in Japanese social organization and the wish to amaeru (to depend and presume on another's benevolence) on the person? (Caudill, p. 15). Are there variations in risk-taking behavior among occupational groups? Given the greater job mobility of managers and skilled laborers, Caudill calls for research on whether these groups are by psychological measures greater risk-takers. Also, in rural areas, is the personality structure of younger, non-inheriting sons more prone to risk-taking? This trait was "objectively called for," and socialization practices may have

emphasized risk-taking and independence training for younger sons. But we need studies to demonstrate that risk-taking behavior actually developed.

Caudill (p. 26) notes that "tense interpersonal relations" are a common neurotic symptom in Japanese psychiatric patients. This has been noted by many students of Japanese behavior, yet what we lack are rigorous observational studies, and better instruments with which to measure these patterns. Another intriguing research problem pointed up by Wagatsuma is the mutual misperception of American G.I.'s and Japanese war brides as to each other's personality. As Wagatsuma describes it, we have a classic instance of each party mistaking stereotyped role expectations (the willowy, submissive Japanese woman, the strong, masculine American male) for actual personality structure. Research in this area can be carried out in the U.S., and again has theoretical implications of a sort that interest behavioral scientists not interested in Japan as such. (Wagatsuma, p. 16.)

Most social psychological research on Japanese has been rather "loose" and impressionistic. Recently, experimental laboratory studies have begun to gain ground. Frager reports tightly controlled studies of this sort which attempt to show comparatively (by replicating Western studies) how conformity-prone the Japanese are. Caudill reminds us how common it has been to characterize Japanese as very conformity prone. Yet this is not supported by recent experimental studies. A major breakthrough has been that when Japanese (e.g., students) break away from conformity, they do not move towards individualism, but towards what Frager calls anticonformity. Frager (p. 8) asserts that out of hundreds of conformity studies in many countries, it is only in Japan that anticonformity is observed. Curiously, then, the old stereotype of the conformity-ridden Japanese does not entirely die. Anticonformity is very much the offspring of previous stress upon conformity. Frager also draws on Lifton's work which suggests that Japanese students are particularly prone to alienation since it is in their university years that they are cut off from the primary ties of both family and subsequent paternalistic company or work clique.

These are but a few of the many possibilities in the area of Japanese personality and social psychology. A separate conference in the future could easily be manned in this area of the behavioral sciences.

III

In the previous sections I have dealt only with suggestions for research on Japan. Space and time do not permit a discussion of problems of teaching, etc. I was struck most at

the Houston conference by Karsh's pessimism concerning the likelihood that sociology can recruit many students to Japanese studies. DeVos makes a useful suggestion (p. 14) that the sheer fascination living in Japan has for foreigners is still true. Therefore, it behooves the Joint Committee to find ways of financing undergraduates in the U.S. to spend a year in Japan. This will produce an appetite for things Japanese that can then sustain the student through graduate studies. To expect that an American will undertake Japanese studies and have no first-hand experience in Japan until his dissertation research is expecting too much.

I shall conclude as I began. The "solution" to attracting students into the Japanese social science field is, in my opinion, primarily to make studies in this field so salient in terms of theory, methods and findings that one cannot be a mainline behavioral scientist without being au courant with developments in the Japanese field. As aspects of Japanese studies take on general, comparative relevance to these disciplines of sociology, anthropology and social psychology, then we shall have overcome many of the obstacles to development in the behavioral sciences-Japan.

REFERENCES¹

- Befu, Harumi, "Studies in Japanese Kinship: A Review"
 Bennett, John W., "Some Observations on Behavioral Science Research on Japan, with Special Reference to Anthropology"
 Caudill, William, "The Psychological Study of Japan"
 Cole, Robert, "Economic Growth and Social Change: Achievements, Problems and Prospects"
 DeVos, George, "Social Problems in Japan: The Research of American Social Scientists"
 Frager, Robert, "Social Conformity: Studies in Cross-Cultural Social Psychology"
 Iga, Mamoru, "Studies of Social Problems by Japanese Scholars"
 Karsh, Bernard, "The Sociological Study of Japan"
 *Koyama, Takashi, "Kazuko keitai no shuki-teki henka." In Seichi Kitano and Yuzuru Okada, eds. Ie--sono kozo bunseki. Tokyo: 1959: 67-83
 Lanham, Betty B., "Early Socialization: Stability and Change"
 *Mannari, Hiroshi, "Business Elite no kokusai hikaku," Kansai gakuin Shakaigakubu Kiyo, No. 9-10, 1964
 *Mannari, Hiroshi, Business Elite. Chuokoronsha, 1965
 *Mannari, Hiroshi, "Kogyoka to shokugyoido," Kansai gakuin Shakaigakubu Kiyo, No. 14, 1966
 Nakane, Chie, "The Anthropological Study of Japan"
 *Takada, Yasuma, Shakaigaku Genri. 1919
 Tominaga, Ken'ichi (A), "Continuity and Change in Japanese Sociology: Past, Present and Future"
 Tominaga, Ken'ichi (B), "Social Stratification and Social Mobility in Japanese Society, 1955-1967"
 Wagatsuma, Hiroshi, "The Psychological Study of Japan"

¹All references here are to papers written for the Houston conference, except for published works, indicated here by *. 219

7b: ANNEX D

Communication from John W. Bennett,
Washington University

The first, and, to my way of thinking, overriding factor in behavior-science approaches to Japan is language and language training. I think I can say without fear of exaggeration that difficulties in language training are the major cause of what I regard as a decline or stagnation in the study of Japan by social-behavior scientists (I refer here to: anthropology, sociology, social psychology, clinical psychology, and some branches of psychiatry, with the usual borderline cases of some economics and political-science inquiries). The difficulty with language training can be put in a very few words: no, or very few, American universities are geared to teach language in such a way as to permit a fluent, "field" control of the language, which is the kind that behavior scientists require, since they work with language as a form of data; that is, the inner semantic dimensions of language are an essential part of their information and without this they are lost, although good interpreter-translators can go a long way. But their expense precludes young students from using them, and generally younger workers are not sufficiently sure of themselves to use interpreters successfully. Lacking control over the language, they are stopped before they begin, since they find it impossible to do the work they need to do to get a degree.

The "first generation" of behavior-science students of Japan were men trained in the military language programs. This generation has not really reproduced itself, since the universities lack language training of the efficiency of the military programs. The output of students capable of handling the language at the level required for most work in the field is very small and is confined only to those who have had unusually fortunate experiences in language training and academic experience. Generally this means people who have had the good fortune to have studied the language for at least three years before they went ahead with their disciplinary degree work. If a man or woman is expected to learn the language at the same time he does his disciplinary work, the chances of a successful outcome are, in my judgment, about one in ten. This is based on the failures I have witnessed myself in two universities. Not even the really intensive institute programs, like the Michigan Center, have produced the number of social science scholars on Japan one would have expected on the basis of the investments made in these programs.

The last paragraph underlines the great difficulty in getting the disciplines to make allowances for the special needs and timing of Japan specialists. It is a rare disciplinary department that will support a graduate student an extra year

or two simply to get his language. It is my impression that history and the arts, which rely heavily on language, are more liberal on this score. But the social sciences, possibly because in many universities they are poorly supplied with funds, do little. This means that a student who hopes to get a degree in anthropology can expect to receive support only for the two years he is actually working on his anthropology, and if he must learn Japanese, he will have to find other means of financing. There probably are a few departments with built-in provisions for this, and many of us stretch a fellowship now and then to let a man make some progress on his language, but the practice is sufficiently rare so that the number of students going into Japan studies is small.

The important point in all this is simply that in the social-behavior sciences, materials for research and study must be collected in the field, by and large. This requires a command of the spoken language. Most language programs are geared to a slow acquirement of literary skills, not speech, and this may suit the institutional and historical fields who often rely mainly on written documents. It is not adequate for the social sciences.

Another problem I see before me is the scarcity of materials available for teaching courses on modern Japanese society and culture. This may seem surprising, since there are a number of short things like Norbeck's paperbound on Japanese family life or Passin's pamphlet on the Occupation, etc. In fact, however, these are not sufficient to teach a professional course to graduate students, and here is where the data are scarce. I have spent, all told, six months in Japan in the past 2-1/2 years, simply gathering materials in the vernacular and hiring translators to get them into usable form for teaching them in English. I am speaking of basic research data in urban ecology, economy, demography, consumption behavior, migration trends, social survey data on welfare, medical care, university life, etc. etc. All of this stuff, absolutely essential for a graduate-level course, must be obtained as best one can; there are extremely few sources in English that provide good, abundant, and reliable data. The problem transcends graduate education and teaching: it is a major barrier to our general knowledge of Japan and our need to understand this innovative and changing society and international partner. It is not enough to say that there are a number of Americans who can read Japanese and hence are not barred to the vernacular data; this material must be made available in usable form for teaching in English, and this means someone must take the time to translate and reorganize it. I try to scrounge assistantships whenever I can for Japanese students to help me build up a basic data bank for teaching purposes. For some years now I have had an idea for setting up a project to prepare a basic handbook on modern Japanese society, and I may seek a little money from the SSRC-ACLU this Fall for just that.

Turning to the question of what has been accomplished in behavior-science research, I can only repeat certain conclusions expressed in my paper. Let me attempt greater clarity of expression:

(1) The accomplishments thus far are probably better than one would expect considering the obstacles, and poorer than they ought to be considering the general capability of American social science. Aside from early classics like Chrysanthemum and the Sword, and Dore's book on Tokyo, social science studies of Japan have not made major contributions to theory and method, although in a number of fields, like studies of kinship and achievement motivation, respectable contributions at the empirical-generalization level have appeared. It might be argued that this simply reflects the language barrier and the continuing need for American students to do elementary descriptive work. But despite these evident shortcomings, a considerable amount of research has been done and published, as the various bibliographic collections, like the ones attached to the papers in the Houston conference, will attest. I do not believe that the entire corpus of work reaches a quality level comparable to the best of the materials in the institutional and historical fields, but as I noted above, perhaps it is better than one might expect considering the obstacles.

(2) The two fields in the behavior sciences where work has been more or less continuous and of a reasonably high quality level are: (a) kinship and family studies, especially inquiries attempting to show how kinship roles are used as models for other roles in Japanese society; and (b) socialization studies, especially in the area of the acquirement of motivation for achievement and success. In both instances we are dealing with sectors of Japanese society where significant differences from the typical American patterns are evident. Thus the fields have been selected for intensive study largely on the basis of culture contrast. This is not necessarily bad, of course, but it does mean that significant problems peculiar to Japanese society itself may be overlooked.

(3) The most seriously neglected fields, in my opinion, are: (a) Social stratification and occupational mobility. Work in this field is being done primarily by Japanese scholars who unfortunately use American methods, and thus they obtain results which are all too familiar; that is, they make Japan look American. This also points up the need for a native Japanese social science. This has simply not materialized; Japanese scholars continue to use Western concepts, theories, and methods. (b) Relations between country and city, or in general, micro-macro relationships. In this context the social sciences, Japanese and American, have made only the barest beginning at constructing a theory of Japanese society as a whole entity. One of the causes has been the persisting tradition of community studies, or studies of small sectors of

Japanese society without reference to sampling or representativeness. And the lack of easily-used data is another contributing cause. If national-level data on social trends and processes could be made available for Western workers we would move much faster. (c) Studies of the Japanese sense of social problems, and in general contemporary social thought. How do the Japanese look at social problems and social planning? What goals are emerging and how are these related to social structure and culture change?

(4) In addition to a lack of a theory of Japanese society, I feel that the theoretical precepts guiding studies of Japanese sociocultural change are outmoded and much too Western in flavor. There is a persistent habit of regarding Japan in a dual context: the Orient and the West, and measuring change or the lack of it from these two reference points. This viewpoint is inadequate to handle the evident native foundations of urbanism, mobility, achievement, efficiency and the like. The better studies in the field rise above this point of view, but not articulately enough and there is no comprehensive attempt to reformulate a theory of change and development. Social scientists need to make historical studies of change in Japan in which they attempt to control the variables with the use of historical data. We have only one or two good examples of this type of thing. Obviously social scientists need to collaborate with historians here. There is too much disciplinary separateness.

7b: ANNEX E

Communication from George A. DeVos,
California, Berkeley

I cannot stress too strongly from my vantage point the strong scientific value of studying Japanese comparatively. This holds true for the three disciplines of anthropology, sociology and psychology. I am acutely aware in my own work of previous generalizations that have been made in each of these disciplines that do not hold up when they are tested comparatively in Japan.

Japan, from the standpoint of sociology and anthropology, is a case history of very rapid social change that should be documented and systematically explored by both American and Japanese social scientists working in constant communication with one another. In the substantive papers presented at the conference at Rice, there are numerous illustrations of the testing of conclusions in Japan of work originally done in the United States. To illustrate very briefly from our own work, as you are aware, in Arakawa Ward, we find that the growth patterns of Tokyo are different from those found in American cities. The way they are different and the differences in

handling social problems in the urban environment are extremely stimulating as tests for conclusions made previously based solely on the American experience. My own point of view, therefore, would be that we cannot stress too strongly the intense value of comparative research in the growth of social science disciplines. Japan is a peculiarly rich site for comparison, both because of the rapid modernization that is going on and secondly, the fact that the Japanese themselves are producing a large number of social scientists who are capable of valuable collaborative research which will be far beyond what any American specialist in Japan can do. It is part of our task to help form a bridge of communication for Japanese research itself as part of our own efforts in contributing to a worldwide body of scientific data in the social sciences.

Turning now to the immediate scene, I think that specific proposals are possible for implementing research to realize this comparative potential. Our first task is to take a forthright stand about the validity of area studies as part of any of the disciplines involved in the social sciences. We ourselves do not have to be sold on the fact that a political scientist, for example, is a better political scientist if he has a comparative approach involving a thorough knowledge of Japan on the one hand and perhaps a European or American political setting on the other. I myself think that the tensions between area studies and our discipline are part of the departmental politics and policies, not due to the nature of the scientific problems themselves. I suspect that the existing tensions between area studies and departments is more due to members who are not involved in such studies creating issues of "loyalty." This is very short sighted. I believe it is highly valuable for a social science department of any excellence to actively seek to have a number of individuals specializing in specific cultural or national entities such as Japan. We in anthropology, of course, have no problem in this respect, since it is a requirement of our discipline itself to be comparative and to gather data and do research in areas other than our own. Gradually, I believe, a realization of the value of comparative work and area specialization is making headway in political science departments and departments of sociology. Psychology, however, is still a field that has only in rare instances realized the value of comparative work in psychological problems.

Obviously, one of the deterrents to comparative psychology is the lack of language facility on the part of American psychologists. There is no reason, however, that collaborative research could not be better fostered between Japanese and Americans on particular psychological problems. Research designs could be set up in which to test particular hypothesis on both cultural settings, watching out for differences as well as similarities. In the report of Bob Frager given at the conference at Rice he pointed out a number of interesting differences of a psycho-cultural nature that occur when psy-

chological testing is replicated in Japan that contrast with results obtained in the United States. These differences raise new theoretical issues in psychology which must be answered by further research.

7b: ANNEX F

Communication from Richard K. Beardsley,
University of Michigan

I suggest five areas of research, below, in which academic activity seems likely to increase. Since this growth now seems likely to be hesitant and fumbling unless developmental help is furnished, I suggest here several modes of help: (1) bibliographic research to furnish background; (2) an information center or clearing-house to provide updated information and guidance to researchers and institutions; and (3) opportunities for conferences, symposia, and even summer seminars of binational character and a mixture of academic and non-academic participants.

These needs are suggested in order to provide better communication and foster occasions for team research, without which the new areas of research will be seriously handicapped. The intent is to erode present boundaries between: (a) Japanese and U.S. academic researchers; (b) separate but related disciplines; and (c) non-academic, practicing professionals and academic scholars, both of which have subject matter in common. The research areas described below are large and complex; they are not amenable to productive findings solely within one discipline. They have much in common between our two nations as advanced modernizers. Finally, they are matters that are the concern, often, of government offices and non-academic organizations, where there are assembled knowledgeable persons and considerable quantities of data that, at present, are almost beyond the reach of university scholars.

1. Urbanization, Urban Affairs; Decentralization

Japan's urban growth is bringing phenomena and problems matching--yet not necessarily duplicating--those of the United States. Differential migration and mechanisms to facilitate the integration of migrants to urban areas; transit and housing patterns and problems; occupational differentiation and reorganization; cultural modernization; and many other matters deserve study and are beginning to attract the attention of scholars. Urban studies to date provide only a bare beginning. These matters are the daily fare of hundreds of practicing professionals, however; they tap sources of data virtually unknown to academics, who would surely benefit from contact with these persons and their data. Likewise, data are accumulating on contrary movements in Japan: on the diffusion

of urban patterns into rural areas, or on decentralization of industry and its impact on rural people and their ways.

2. Social Tensions; Social Problems (Poverty, etc.)

Japan's socioeconomic development, extremely high when measured (as it usually is) in aggregate terms, is actually quite uneven. Certain communities and subgroups have little share in prosperity and modernizing opportunities. We need study of agricultural transformation and stagnation, and of economic and political tensions--how they are expressed and how they are being dealt with. In cities, as well, we see abundant evidence of tension growing in proportion to the disparity of development: on the part of consumers, small business, groups inextricably enmeshed in poverty (real or relative) and deprivation of amenities. Some responses to these tensions are militant (student movements may serve as an instance); other persons turn to the demagogy of "new religions" or to other hopes for solution to their frustrated expectations. Studies from various viewpoints are possible; like urbanization and the areas noted below, the social tensions of Japan are in some measure unique, in some measure thoroughly matched in other nations of rapid development. Measures to assemble scholars at least on a bi-national basis (U.S.-Japan) but preferably on a wider basis to pinpoint fruitful themes for cross-national comparative study certainly deserve consideration.

3. Institutional Change

Our perception of possibilities in this area is broadening. Scholars already have been giving attention to changing patterns of family, community, rural life, patronage systems. Much more now appears to call for examination. One tack is comparison among institutions that foster a state of tension owing to uneven rates of adjustment; this state is notable in institutions touched by or controlled by the government: transportation, education, credit and finance, public health, etc. Another tack is the cross-institutional study of the pressure toward altering patterns of traditional organization that are repeated in various older institutions: seniority systems, systems of group-centered patron-protegeship, authoritarianism and paternalism, etc. Studies of such phenomena already under way have the promise of providing tests of the hypothesis that industrialization universally tends to force convergent development of institutions in every society. Such studies can contribute in broad fashion to general social science theory.

4. Social Mobility and Stratification

Japan's increasing mobility of labor, the broadened spectrum of economic opportunities, and wage improvements have encouraged sociologists to apply U.S. assumptions, concepts,

and methods of gauging stratification; the results are not yet very satisfactory, and the lack of fit between the two societies calls for further study. Moreover, we need more work on the question of continuity of traditional group ties within the new social and occupational structure, as a further test of the convergence hypothesis noted above. There is, moreover, economic and political interest in the questions of how shifts in the power position of particular social groups affects mobility and vice versa.

5. Mass Culture

Japanese work (not always scholarly) is piling up a great deal of aggregate data on consumer choices, living patterns, reading habits, value judgments, etc., that provide indices to the growth of mass culture. More is involved than mere shifts and fluctuations of consumption behavior; rather, these data testify to sometimes marked reformulation of Japanese cultural traditions. The rise of mass culture poses intriguing questions: of continuity or discontinuity with tradition in general; of the effect of mass tastes on aesthetics and art; of the implications for religious behavior and organization (or for secularization) and political behavior; and of changes in the sense of personal and group identity of the Japanese.

APPENDIX 7c

Conference on the Status of Studies in
Japanese Economics

March 15-16, 1969, SSRC, New York

I. INTRODUCTION

The executive meeting of the subcommittee on economics decided on October 28, 1968, to hold a survey conference on Japanese economics on March 15-16, 1969. As one of several disciplinary survey conferences sponsored by the Joint Committee on Japanese Studies, the purpose of the economics survey was to evaluate the state of research, teaching and associated problems in Japanese economics, as well as to suggest proposals for future substantive conferences. To that end Henry Rosovsky of Harvard University, with the assistance of Kozo Yamamura of Boston College, organized the conference reported here. The conference was attended by 25 economists and one member of the Joint Committee staff (see Annex A).

II. STUDIES OF THE JAPANESE ECONOMY IN ENGLISH

A. Remarks by Kozo Yamamura

American interest in the economics of development generally and in the high level growth of the postwar Japanese economy in particular have stimulated widespread interest among American economists. Since 1955 approximately 60 books and over 300 articles on the Japanese economy have been published in English. The areas well covered or developing rapidly in the literature are (1) quantitative studies of Japanese growth, such as those by Rosovsky and Nakamura, and (2) specialized areas of economic growth, such as money and banking, international trade, labor, economic history, dual structure industrial organization, and econometrics. "Think pieces" have also added new dimensions in terms of economic models, and interdisciplinary research has contributed to our understanding of Japanese economic behavior.

There are five areas that require much greater attention. (1) Although we have accumulated considerable data for aggregate growth patterns, we do not have good studies of individual Japanese industries in English--iron and steel, shipbuilding, textiles, etc. Micro studies of Japanese industry will further our knowledge of the aggregate patterns of Japanese industrialization. The induction of new technology, capital formation, labor recruitment, management, international trade and other problems should not, however, only be studied on an individual firm basis but also in terms both of groups of in-

dustries and of geographical regions. (2) What have been the welfare implications of Japan's enormous success in industrialization? It is high time for American economists to investigate real wage levels, income distribution, external diseconomies, the workings and magnitudes of transfer incomes, levels of agricultural income--in other words, the "consequences" or costs of Japan's rapid industrialization. As Simon Kuznets and Miyoshi Shinohara have made clear, we simply have no accurate data on Japanese living standards for the past 100 years. (3) Related to this second area of neglect is the problem of data refinement. Although great progress has been made, as witnessed by the Hitotsubashi series on long term economic statistics, we are far from the end in refining our statistics on the Japanese economy. (4) Empirically oriented studies in Tokugawa economic history are badly needed and should yield useful results, giving the wealth of raw data and the variety of available evidence. (5) Since economic growth is such a highly complex process, greater emphasis is needed on interdisciplinary studies. Students of the Japanese economy have benefited from the research of sociologists, historians, political scientists; collaboration with scholars in other disciplines is necessary, for example, to better understand the economy during the decade of drastic socio-political change from 1920 to 1930.

Responses to the subcommittee's questionnaire to economists in the field of Japanese economics also indicated that these were the basic "blind spots" in current studies, with special emphasis on areas (1) and (2). In addition the responses reveal the need for some sort of "clearing house" for ongoing research, including dissertations in progress and bibliography. Such an organization would also serve to bring together on a regular basis of communication all scholars of the Japanese economy.

B. Discussion

Since only ten to fifteen countries have long-term economic data available for study, the quantitative approach is still the most fruitful and by no means exhausted in terms of (1) data refinement and (2) Japan's pattern of growth in comparison with other nations. Still needed are quantitative studies of the transition between the Bakumatsu and Meiji economies to round out Japan's growth model. Such studies might also prove useful to the developing nations as well. Finally, application of the national income accounting framework to the analysis of industrialization might usefully be combined with micro industry studies.

What can the developed nations learn from Japan's economic development? Obviously, whatever findings which studies of the Japanese economy can yield are significant in investigating many current issues in the developed nations. For example, in the area of policy, the Japanese case is an extremely

valuable one to observe and ask: (1) What research is needed, domestically and internationally, to guide policy makers? (2) Given government secrecy regarding much of the data, how can research proceed on such projects? (3) Since Japan's foreign reserves are extremely vulnerable (e.g., 90% of the Bank of Japan's foreign reserves are private loans from commercial, not official state banks), what is the impact of fluctuating exchange rates? The present merging of monetary and fiscal policies make balance of payment outcomes unclear. (4) The increasing complexity of Japan's trade requires regional and local study, not just nation-by-nation analysis. (5) How does Japanese fear of "foreignization," expressed in the financing of long-term domestic development by short-term loans, compare with other countries? (6) What potential does Japan have as a capital exporting nation, given her policy of borrowing short and lending long? (7) The Japanese institutional innovation of the trading company needs analysis; such an innovation may be useful to developing and developed nations alike. Objections were raised by members of the conference, however, regarding the utility of policy-oriented economic studies.

The creation of intermediate aggregates has affected the major growth industries recently. For example, Japanese shipbuilders are facing stiff competition from specialized shipbuilders in Europe. Steelmaking as well has gotten into a corner, as the recent merger of Fuji and Yawata illustrate. Thirty per cent of Japan's steel must be exported for the industry to break even, yet "voluntary" export quotas have had to be set. The growth of intermediate aggregates in such key industries as shipbuilding and steelmaking is therefore related to the world market, pointing to the need for studies of Japanese industry in a world context. The declining, as well as high growth industries require study, especially in regard to technological innovations, in the world context. Is disaggregation required to make Japanese industry competitive? Japan's options for economic growth are now more controlled by "the outside."

Considerable contributions have been made by non-Japanese scholars in areas "taken for granted" by Japanese scholars. Western economic models have also been extremely useful to Japanese economists, as have quantitative and international perspectives on Japanese economic history. Since Japan has been a spectacular success economically, American scholars may have tended, however, to rationalize that success rather than reveal the roots and problems of economic change.

III. JAPANESE STUDIES OF THE JAPANESE ECONOMY

A. Remarks by Yasukichi Yasuba

Over the past ten to twenty years the most influential

group of Japanese economists has been the Hitotsubashi University economists. Their work has been concentrated in two areas: (1) the compilation of long-term statistics within the framework of social accounting, and (2) quantitative empirical research focused largely on problems of Japan's economic development. The study of national income and its components, based on more dependable long-term estimates, was pioneered by Yuzo Yamada in 1951; his study was followed by a more systematic team effort by Kazushi Ohkawa and others in 1957. This in turn led to the projected 13 volume series of long-term statistics, the first of which, on railways and electrical power, was published in 1965. Since then five more volumes have been published on (1) capital stocks, (2) agriculture, (3) prices, (4) individual consumption expenditures, and (5) government expenditures. One result of the series has been the revision downward of the annual growth rate of agricultural production during 1880-1900 from 2.74% to 1.7%, though this is not as low as the Nakamura estimate of 1.0%. The six volumes thus far published, particularly the statistical estimates, comprise one of the most significant contributions by Japanese economists to the study of the Japanese economy.

Apparently lacking in the Hitotsubashi series as projected were statistics on the balance of payments and the index of industrial production. The former were compiled by Masahito Tatemoto and Masao Baba (1967) and the latter by Yasukichi Yasuba (1966). Yuichi Shionoya has constructed a value-weighted index of industrial production for 1874-1940 on the annual figures for eight major industries (1966). Work has also been done on postwar international indices of industrial and agricultural production as well as the comparative purchasing power of the yen and the dollar.

Studies have been made to ascertain the patterns of Japan's industrial growth, particularly in regard to foreign trade, most notably that by Kaname Akamatsu in 1951. Since then refinements on both the theoretical and empirical level have been made. An ingenious use of an input-output table was devised by Chenery-Shishido-Watanabe in 1962 for the period 1915-1954. A somewhat different approach to this social accounting factorial analysis was taken by Yuichi Shionoya (1967). Instead of measuring deviation from a certain growth path, Shionoya measured the contribution of each element to the growth output in a particular sector. To understand the changing pattern of growth from negative to positive import substitution around 1900 greater attention should be given to changes in commercial policies. Tsunehiko Watanabe has devised highly significant measurements of the residents for the manufacturing industry in the periods 1904-1933 and 1952-1961 (1965).

Perhaps the greatest avalanche of economic studies by Japanese has been devoted to the study of "dual structure" (nijū kōzō). This term implies (1) the coexistence of capitalistic

and family enterprise, (2) the coexistence of technically modern and traditional industry, (3) wide disparity between the two groups in labor productivity, and (4) wide wage differentials between large-scale and small-scale enterprises. Item (1) has been the subject of a bitter but pioneering controversy among Marxist scholars, who equated "industry" with the capitalistic sector and "agriculture" with the traditional family sector. The Kōza-ha ("lectures" faction) presented a dual two-sector model of economic development which posited that the "feudal" rural level of living determined industrial wages, hence profits and other industrial variables. The Rōnō-ha ("labor-farmer" faction) argued that both sectors became capitalistic after 1868. The land reform after the Pacific War proved the Rōnō-ha wrong and the Kōza-ha right, though the latter's theoretical model was wrong: wages were in fact raised by confiscation and redistribution of land.

A modern, non-Marxist version of the dual economy structure has been presented by Kazushi Ohkawa, who devised a model of "disguised equilibrium" (1955). A number of agricultural economists, stimulated by Ohkawa's ideas, formed a study group which produced an analysis of over-occupation in Japanese agriculture (1959). Developments of this model have been made by Kazuo Ohkuchi and his school, who offer a series of trial-and-error explanations. Either a subsistence "institutional" wage or a subsistence marginal productivity for unattached members of the farm household is applicable--in other words, either temporary engagement in non-agricultural activities at a subsistence institutional wage or, in case of commuting from the farm, engagement in subsistence marginal productivity wage activities. In general modern economists tend to support a marginal productivity theory, although difficulties are still encountered. Machiko Kubo and Yasusuke Murakami (1964) have attempted to place the agricultural wage problem in perspective for post land reform Japan. In view of these studies, popular models of dualistic development--the Lewis-Ranis-Fei or Jorgenson models--may prove to be over simple given the intricate labor supply from agriculture in Japan.

Both Kazushi Ohkawa and Ryoshin Minami place the "turning point" in agricultural development somewhere in the postwar period. Shokichi Namiki has found long-term and short-term constancies in the agricultural population and short-term stability in out migration from the rural sector, thus challenging the widely accepted labor reservoir theory of the rural sector (Kazuo Ohkuchi and others). Ryoshin Minami and Akira Ono have questioned Namiki's theory, pointing out that a definite positive association could be found between industrial activities and the size of rural out migration.

Perhaps the first systematic study of wage differentials according to size of firm was that by Mataji Umemura in 1955; Umemura demonstrated the emergence of wide size-oriented differentials by 1932 and their continued existence as of 1951.

Only in 1958 has this trend reversed in the manufacturing industry. Miyohai Shinohara, however, has made the most significant analysis of dual wage structure in his Sangyō Kōzō (the structure of industry), 1959. After noting the imperfect labor market that exists in Japan, a situation indicated by others as well, Shinohara reasons that if productivity in larger firms were higher such firms would pay higher wages than smaller firms, at least to the permanently employed and older workers. Ryutaro Komiya has substantiated this conclusion: he found that the advantages associated with larger firms were absorbed not in monopolistic profits but in higher wages. Shinohara also examined the price controlling power of large firms and their fund-raising power in the capital market, aspects of which have been pursued by Yoshikazu Miyazaki, Kenichi Miyazawa, Susumu Koizumi, and Mitsuo Saito. Explanations of dual wage differentials have been advanced by Takao Sasaki (sugar refining, pulp, etc., as opposed to traditional enterprises), Tsunehiko Watanabe ("induced dualism" based on borrowed technology), and Yasukichi Yasuba (older versus newer, modern industries with significant wage differentials according to size in the former and no significant differentials in the latter as early as 1909-1914). The dualistic wage structure thus appears to be linked to the acclimatization of imported technology.

Japanese economists are divided over calling the rise in consumer prices since the late 1950s "inflation," since wholesale prices have stagnated or declined. They are agreed, however, that the rapid rise in productivity in modern manufacturing industries and relative stagnation in the agriculture, fishing, commerce and service sectors were at the bottom of these surface disturbances. Those who did call this situation "inflation" were divided over a "cost-push" or a "demand-pull" explanation, with the most ardent cost-push advocates being Marxist and the most ardent demand-pull proponents being economists at the Bank of Japan. Perhaps the soundest diagnosis was provided by Osamu Shimomura, who was against calling the process inflation: wholesale prices remained stable because of (1) temporary bottleneck phenomena in fresh food, (2) government price decontrolling, (3) the rising price of services and small enterprise products, and (4) narrowing wage differentials. Econometric models have had some affinity with Shimomura's thesis. With the exception of Shimomura, however, academic economists did not at the time (1960-1961) seem much concerned with the international aspect of the price problem. Shimomura has now been joined by Masahiro Tatemoto, Tadao Uchida, Tsuneo Iida and Kotara Tsujimura in calling attention to the "imported" nature of inflation and the need for liberalizing commercial policy on imports to bring down the CPI.

Other studies bearing on economics have been (1) Marxist studies of many varieties, which have been more important for economic interpretations of political process than for economic theory; (2) "growth" studies by Osamu Shimomura and Tadao

Uchida, which produced a basically Domar model of Japanese growth; (3) policy oriented empirical research and theory-based policy suggestions, particularly those based on price theory, by Ryutaro Komiya; (4) macro econometric models, especially those useful for projection and policy making, by Shigeto Tsuru, Shinichi Ichimura, Masao Baba and others, although it took ten years for such models to be accepted as useful to policy makers.

Ongoing research in Japan includes the Hitotsubashi series on long-term statistics, the study of industrial organization (oligopoly), regional analyses, the Tokugawa heritage (e.g., Akira Hayami on population), entrepreneurial history, economic growth, technological change, Marxist economic history, economic policy, and finally the wartime and colonial economies (subjects which have been taboo until recently).

One of the serious problems in the teaching of economics in Japan is the domination of Marxist approaches in the universities. Many university students can graduate without being exposed to modern economic analysis, given the structure of the Japanese university system.

B. Discussion

The trend toward realistic studies of--and in--the market place among Japanese economists, as opposed to abstract classroom theorizing, is indeed welcome. Since much of the side income of Japanese economists is derived from articles and books for the general reading public, however, there may be a danger that long-term studies of a basic nature will be sacrificed to short-term "saleability." The "menial" compilation of long-term statistics, for example, cannot be fruitfully left to amateur government employees not only for statistical but also for conceptual reasons. Since economists are the users of such data they must be involved in their compilation, given Samuelson's definition of economic theory as the description of empirical regularities.

Despite Japanese studies of manufacturing, especially heavy industry, such studies do not convincingly demonstrate that heavy industrialization was the major causal factor in Japan's rapid growth generally or in the postwar acceleration of growth compared with the prewar period. For example, was heavy industry growth due to the quickened increase in the purchase of consumer durables by households and of machinery by farms and by small units of production during the 1950s and 1960s? What is the source of such consumer purchasing power? Much of the key data for the simple growth model, much less the sub-processes and mechanisms, are lacking. For example, data are needed on deflated net product or income by industrial origin for each major industry from 1950 to the present.

Also lacking are detailed studies of the changes in size

distribution of family income, expenditure, and saving during the postwar years. Such studies are essential to an understanding of inflation and aggregate demand. In Japanese studies of the technological process, much more detail is required on the technological innovations imported, the adaptations made, and the process of diffusion before "technological change" can be isolated as an effective variable in economic growth distinct from such variables as the diffusion of education, changes in incentive devices, etc. Again, such studies require an industry by industry approach, in the secondary and tertiary sectors as well as heavy industry.

A detailed follow-up of the pioneering study of indigenous industries and consumption by Ohkawa and Rosovsky is needed, partly because such work is a very important subject for other Asian countries faced with an "explosion" in their labor forces during the next few decades. Labor intensive, small industries appear to complement big industries by using second-hand equipment, home work places, simple tools and native raw materials. How true is this for Japan's small industries? What are the savings propensities of small industries? How did they keep the indigenous basket of consumption goods so low? How low was it? What technological processes were involved?

The role of government in economic growth has not been adequately studied as one would expect in a country where the curriculum is divided into policy and non-policy courses. Since the activities of government are extremely heterogeneous, the role of government cannot be, as it has been, evaluated in a broad and general way (e.g., Shishido's simulation study). Studies of particular government taxes, particular government expenditures, are required to cope with problems of growth and of welfare.

Long-term economic projects are needed on such subjects as the determination of Meiji growth rates from different approaches or economic assumptions. Perhaps the Japan Economic Research Center should initiate conferences prior to the publication of such data to evaluate the approaches and assumptions of the project.

Since Japanese economists do apply Western models to the Japanese economy, micro studies might reveal modifications to such models. For example, traditional assumptions underlying economic behavior, such as profit maximization, might require modification. Industry studies may in this respect also yield comparative data suitable for interdisciplinary analysis.

Japanese economists have tended to be short-term forecasters; American economists can help stimulate long-term studies. There is also a penchant among non-Marxist economists for mathematical rigor and econometric models at the expense of economic history. An area in economic history particularly

requiring attention is the decade 1935 to 1945.

The issues among Japanese economists are (1) inflation and its interpretation; (2) industrial organization, stimulated by the recent merger of Yawata Steel and Fuji Steel; and (3) growth potential since 1957. Modern economists are few in number as yet, with the Riron Keiryo Keizai Gakkai having only 500 members at present. The modern economists are fairly isolated from the Marxist and neo-Marxist economists.

One vast area that has not been dealt with by Japanese or American economists is that of the costs of economic growth and development. Why did Japan tolerate the welfare sacrifices involved, particularly in the period 1925-1950? Economic research must in some measure be reoriented around the values of Japanese society: household behavior, the variables of "getting ahead." Such basic values should be sought in the economic behavior of firms as well, and in terms of a maximizing process peculiar to Japanese industrial organization. In welfare maximization, moreover, distribution and not production is the main process, requiring examination of tertiary industries. In analyzing the costs of industrialization, indices of industrialization waste must be developed. Costs are related to the logic of Japan's collective behavior. Related to the values of public finance, for example, are the values of the state as supreme collectivity.

IV. PROBLEMS OF TEACHING AND RESEARCH

Several problems arise in the teaching of Japanese economics in the United States. First, very few institutions offer courses or have positions in Far Eastern economics, let alone Japanese economics and economic history. Second, the problem of area versus discipline confront the student: promising students tend toward a disciplinary major. Related to this problem is that of language. No student of Japanese economic history, for example, could deal with his subject matter without a firm knowledge of Japanese. Japanese language training greatly prolongs the graduate school process. Fourth, there is some question regarding the appeal of Japanese economic history. How dull is it? Is there not a need for generalizations that go beyond specific periods of Japanese economic history and beyond the Japanese economy in general? Finally, there is simply a lack of data in the United States, not only for teaching but also for research purposes. The availability of data in Japan, however, is such that, at least in terms of research, comparative study (binational and regional) is now possible.

In pursuing research, binational collaboration and regular modes of communication among American scholars of the Japanese economy are essential. Extensive assistance by Japanese

scholars in a team arrangement might be the most fruitful approach to binational collaboration. A "clearing house" for such communication might prove highly useful. It was agreed that a meeting of economists would be held at the next Association for Asian Studies convention to review bibliography and to pursue the issue of regularized communication. Koji Taira agreed to chair a session which will examine recent works by Japanese economists and economic historians at the AAS meeting in 1970.

7c: ANNEX A

Participants

Martin Bronfenbrenner, Carnegie-Mellon University
 Kee-il Choi, College of William and Mary
 Jerome B. Cohen, City University of New York
 Robert Evans, Jr., Brandeis University
 Masahiro Fujita, Kobe University
 Leon Hollerman, Claremont Men's College
 Simon Kuznets, Harvard University
 Solomon B. Levine, University of Wisconsin
 William W. Lockwood, Princeton University
 Koichi Mera, Harvard University
 James I. Nakamura, Columbia University
 Seiji Naya, National Bureau of Economic Research, New York
 Kazushi Ohkawa, Hitotsubashi University
 Harry T. Oshima, University of Hawaii
 Robert S. Ozaki, California State College, Hayward
 Terutono Ozawa, Colorado State University
 Henry Rosovsky, Harvard University
 Eugene Rotwein, Queens College
 Kazuo Sato, The United Nations
 Ryuzo Sato, Brown University
 Koji Taira, Stanford University
 David A. Titus, Wesleyan University
 Arlon R. Tussing, University of Alaska
 Kozo Yamamura, Boston College
 Yasukiichi Yasuba, Osaka University

APPENDIX 7d

Conference on the Status of Studies in
Modern Japanese History

November 8-9, 1968, SSRC, New York

I. INTRODUCTION

In August 1968 Albert Craig of Harvard University agreed to chair an ad hoc subcommittee to evaluate the state of research and associated problems in the field of modern Japanese history. To that end Mr. Craig organized the survey conference reported here. The conference was attended by 18 historians, a sociologist and a member of the staff (see Annex A).

II. TOKUGAWA HISTORY

A. Tokugawa Intellectual History1. Remarks by H. D. Harootunian

Japanese scholars have devoted considerably more energy to the study of Tokugawa thought than have their American counterparts. Applying the German emphasis on the history of ideas, Japanese scholars first concerned themselves with tracing the development of whole sets of doctrines. This "history of philosophy" approach, however, was one of the intellectual casualties of the controversy between Marxist historians of the Kōza-ha and Rōnō-ha during the 1920's. At the beginning of the Pacific War a further change in Japanese studies of intellectual history took place. Pioneered by scholars such as Nagata Hiroshi, Hani Gorō, and Maruyama Masao, the attempt was made to place ideas in a socially meaningful context, and to treat currents of thought as representative of social forces. Such efforts were more than attempts to locate the source of ideas as "official" or "anti-Bakufu," for example. A lasting contribution of this approach was its attempt to relate thought and ideology during the Tokugawa period. From this also developed attempts to locate the sources of "modern" ideology and thought in the late Tokugawa period. The Tokugawa period became, as a consequence, the "relevant past" for Japan's intellectual modernization.

At present the dominant current of Japanese scholarship on Tokugawa thought is to evaluate patterns of thought as accommodations to social change, to investigate Bakumatsu thought for "truly" anti-Bakufu ideologues, for example. Writings by Japanese intellectual historians today are concerned with schools and personalities involved in the "new

consciousness" of the Bakumatsu period: the awareness of (1) domestic decay and (2) the foreign threat.

There are several limitations of Japanese studies of Tokugawa intellectual history: (1) Japanese intellectual historians have established for their American counterparts a chronological rehearsal of ideas in the Tokugawa period that has amounted to a "tyranny of chronology." (2) Japanese scholars have elaborated an investigatory net that catches only certain subjects and consequently leaves out whole areas of intellectual activity. (3) The primary concern with "modernity" has ignored aesthetic and artistic patterns of thought and norms of taste during the Tokugawa period; these are not considered relevant to modernization. The excessive concern with modernization is an ideological stance toward the study of thought that defines the subjects to be studied. It is now no longer adequate, however, to "unmask" ideologies based on the dichotomy of modern/anti-modern. Approaches embracing the totality of thought in a given period, such as Geertz's Ideology as a Cultural System, are needed.

2. Discussion

A change in approach to Japanese history in general appears imminent. The evolution of approaches to Japanese history thus far may be typed as follows: (1) political history, (2) cultural history, (3) Marxist history, and (4) most recent, modernization history. Mr. Harootunian is calling for the study of all aspects of intellectual history "for its own sake." At present new empirical methods add new dimensions to the study of thought, at least in terms of methodology. How, for example, is the scholar to distinguish between the "normative" (official expectations) and the "non-normative" (irrational) canons of taste? Moreover, since previous concern with cultural history was heavily Germanic, a return to the study of cultural thought by historians would need to be (1) more concerned with aesthetics, (2) less pure, and (3) less romantic.

Another topic is the study of Tokugawa Confucianism to ascertain the sources of intellectual change. For example, the pattern of intellectual change of a Confucianist, such as Yamaga Soko or Ogyū Sorai under new influences coming from China might be analogous to the pattern of change of a modernist, such as Katō Hiroyuki in 1881 under the impact of a new wave of Western ideas. Another neglected area is the intellectual development of Tokugawa Buddhism. One reason for such neglect is that such studies would not "plug in" to "modernity." "Going barefoot" through the sources, studying the relation between thought and society in its own age, is essential to break the lock-step approach of "modernization."

Ronald Dore's study of Tokugawa education was discussed as a specific example of scholarship on Tokugawa intel-

lectual history. Questions were raised about the mixture of influences on the Tokugawa pupil and the methodological problem of measuring such influences.

3. Conclusions

- a. The application of modernization theory to the study of Tokugawa thought is at best only one approach.
- b. Study of thought in the Tokugawa period must be undertaken for "its own sake" and in terms of discontinuity as well as continuity in the total society at a given period.
- c. The study of thought should emphasize norms of taste as well as articulated social philosophies.
- d. Such a refocusing on Tokugawa thought might not only uncover new substantive areas but also lead to a new chronology and to new empirical tests in examining the relation between "thought" and "society," articulated expectations and social norms. This approach should retain the emphasis on thought in socially meaningful contexts without (1) simply applying modernity criteria, or (2) returning to the purist romanticism of the German school of cultural history.

B. Tokugawa Institutional History

1. Remarks by Dan Fenno Henderson

Detailed work on how the Tokugawa power structure minimized conflicts and dissipated tensions in society is notable for its absence. What, for example, was the role of the lawyer? There were at least two distinct lawyer roles, the Kujiyado and Kujishi, but very little is known about them. As in Tokugawa intellectual history, there is an equal need to "go barefoot" in the study of Tokugawa institutions in order to avoid inappropriate Western legal conceptualism. At present Japanese scholars are producing studies and collections of materials on Bakufu-han relations as well as hatamoto materials. American scholars should take advantage of the new theories and data. In working with primary sources on Tokugawa institutions it is essential for American scholars to work with Japanese historians. Many primary sources are as yet not reduced to print; translation of such basic sources as the Osadamegaki has begun only recently. Japanese historians have also begun to study han legislation and the rule-making process in individual han. One area that has been much neglected is that of money-lending practices and the concrete role of merchants in Tokugawa society.

2. Discussion

Japanese historians are well along in the study of Tokugawa institutions on the local level as well as the Bakufu and Bakufu-han level. Collections of documents in local libraries make it even more feasible for American historians to delve into local institutions, including the emergence of Tokugawa feudal institutions. Japanese historians have made significant contributions to the study of han government and Bakufu-han relations. In approaching such studies, however, there is a problem in selecting model han. Second, local studies need to be developed over time; an individual han requires analysis through the entire Tokugawa period. Such studies in the aggregate might produce a new and more meaningful chronology. Finally, such studies of Tokugawa feudal institutions will make it possible and desirable for genuine comparative work: the English manor with the chigyo, or Tudor institutions at the national level with the Bakufu.

Documents on the Tozama han in particular are readily available, making it possible to analyze the vertical dimension of han government, the ties among the various layers of han hierarchy. Both our regional and national perspective on Tokugawa institutions is too unitary. The change in han structures as well as Bakufu offices over time needs far greater attention. For example, one common trend in both national and local institutions is bureaucratization and its attendant specialization. The growth of bureaucracy, moreover, cannot be dissociated from the "spirit of the times," the intent and expectations of those actively and passively involved in the process of change.

A further area of study is that of the city in Tokugawa Japan, a field in which comparison is possible by applying theories, such as the Pirenne thesis, developed to explain the emergence of Western medieval towns. As a corollary, much remains to be done on local government: land regulations, the village, and the market system. What degree of autonomy did local communities have in Tokugawa Japan? Does religion explain communal solidarity? In comparing Tokugawa institutions to Western counterparts, however, there is a serious problem involved with comparability and the definition of structures to be compared.

How does one explain the homogeneity of administration over the some 300 distinct units comprising the Tokugawa polity? Tokugawa government, both national and regional, is characterized by the insistence on and persistence of the committee form. Why? How did such an administrative "monstrosity" as the Bakufu system survive? We know next to nothing about role development, about the interaction between role and personality. English biographies of Tokugawa figures are "depressing."

In the field of Tokugawa economic history, studies of price structures have only just begun. There is a great need for quantitative data on economic growth as well. What correlations can be developed between population and volume of production? Finally, comparisons between the great merchant houses of Osaka and their European counterparts are now possible and desirable.

3. Conclusions

- a. Japanese documentary collections and the work of Japanese scholars now make it possible to examine Bakufu government, Bakufu-han relations, han government and the infrastructure of han governments in detail, without restriction from modernization theory or from a simplistic unitary view of the Tokugawa "polity."
- b. Han and local structures of government, as well as Bakufu administration, should be studied in terms of (1) conflict resolution, (2) role and personality development, and (3) internal change over time.
- c. Opportunities for comparing Tokugawa feudal institutions, including cities, with European counterparts now exist and should be exploited.
- d. Studies of Tokugawa economic growth and the operation of socio-economic institutions, such as land tenure and the market system, are only now beginning.

III. MEIJI HISTORY

A. Diplomatic History; Remarks by Akira Iriye

The publication of a 14-volume history of Japanese diplomacy after 1914 has been undertaken by the Hara Shobo (publisher), a study concentrating on policy making. But diplomacy is only one small aspect of Japan's relations with the outer world. The basic question is one of expansion, particularly in the late Tokugawa period. A particularly great need is the study of the importation of Western theories of expansion by Japanese intellectuals and statesmen in the Meiji period, by Nitobe Inazō, for example. Expansion, furthermore, was not only military but also commercial and demographic; comparative studies of imperialism should add greatly to the understanding of Japanese expansion. In terms of Japanese emigrants and Japanese abroad (officials, students, tourists), what influence did they exert on official policy making? Another comparative area applicable to the Japanese experience is that of colonialism, which is currently being studied by a number of Harvard graduate students.

B. Political History

1. Remarks by Bernard Silberman

Studies of Meiji political history have had a chronological, not substantive, emphasis. Whole areas of research alternatives exist: (1) Structural change: How did the bureaucracy, or interest groups, evolve? (2) Functions: What did such structures do and what were the interrelations among them? (3) Role Changes: What were the norms of leadership, the modes of recruitment? For example, why did the political parties recruit bureaucrats? To test theories of role development, more work on political biography is required. (4) Policy implementation: Why? (5) Political ideology: What were the available models? Why were "politicians" viewed as "corrupt"? What about the emergence of private ideologies and the rejection of public values? How does ideology correlate with factionalism?

2. Discussion

These are "ideal" questions. Where are the academic "battle lines" in Meiji political history? In social history, for example, there have been extensive studies of local uprisings and the "freedoms and rights movement." One weakness of Japanese scholarship in the field of politico-legal history stems from the structure of the Japanese university, which has chairs in Tokugawa legal systems and chairs in constitutional history, but no chairs to cover the legal history of the late Tokugawa and early Meiji period. On the other hand, historians have done a great deal of research on the "progressive" political parties. An outstanding recent contribution on this subject is Masumi Junnosuke's Kindai Seitō Shiron (4 vols.).

In studying the evolution of Meiji political institutions there are implicit assumptions that Western institutional forms are important: the Diet, political parties. Can Meiji political history be placed in such a context? Would not a more functional approach be fruitful?

Much remains to be done on the interrelation between socio-economic changes and Meiji politics. What impact did changes in the land tenure system have on politics? What implications does the Nakamura-Rosovsky controversy have for social and political history? Studies are needed of the land tax reform to help resolve this problem. Industrial cartels were quick to develop around each industry and then to interlock. What relationship is there between the modern cartel and the Tokugawa kabu nakama? Is there a relationship between the entrepreneurial type, as studied by Hirschmeier, and cartel formation? How did local areas respond to government initiative in industrial projects? Specific institutions of government, such as the finance ministry, require detailed study in this respect. How did Osaka change from a commercial to an

industrial center? Much more attention should be paid to the formation, organization and governance of Meiji cities. Class changes, such as the removal of the daimyo from political centrality and the creation of a new aristocracy, have also been neglected.

3. Conclusions

- a. Meiji diplomatic history should be placed in the context of Japanese expansion, the importation of Western theories of imperialism, and the experience of Japanese abroad.
- b. Meiji political history has focused on a chronological rehearsal of events to the neglect of structural and functional changes, including role and personality development, policy implementation, and political ideology.
- c. Studies of Meiji history should integrate social and economic changes in agriculture, the cities, and business organizations, with political changes, as well as treat the impact of central government policies on local institutions.

C. Meiji Intellectual History

1. Remarks by Kenneth Pyle

There have been marked changes in the picture of Meiji intellectual history given to us by Japanese scholars: (1) Revisionist trends have brought a more balanced picture of the Meiji period by focusing not only on "progressive" thought, but also on the thought and ideology of "national essence," for example. (2) The broadened purview of the historian of the 1960's has focused attention not only on intellectual leaders at the national level but also on the acceptance of enlightenment thought throughout society. Kano Masanao, for example, has dealt with the ideas expressed by the national youth group movement of the late Meiji period.

A basic deficiency in the treatment of intellectual history remains, however: a failure to go beyond the literal expression and to probe inner intellectual experience and concern. We need to look at the subproblems of cultural identity, cultural tension, and inner conflict in, for example, evaluating the commitment to Western thought and ideas. Without such studies one is at a loss to explain radical changes of thought, conversions and tenkō. Inattention to the inner experience of Japanese intellectuals leads to further areas of neglect or inadequate study: (1) the relation between industrialization and cultural adaptation; (2) the psychological price of modernization, as seen, for example, in the prevalence of "brain disorder" in certain periods such as the Meiji

period; (3) the meaning and function of "the spirit of the times" in Japanese intellectual history; and (4) the nature and causes of "reaction" and "nationalism."

2. Discussion

How best can we discover the "inner man"; evaluate the degree of role playing as opposed to inner commitment? Would an examination of literature reveal any distinction between genuine attitudes and role playing? Why does "introspection" become a mode, a style? An examination of literature, especially popular or third rate, might reveal as well the "spirit of the times" in a given period. The degree of "genuine" alienation at a given time might possibly be measured for society in general by (1) the emergence of new religions and the number of converts, and (2) indices of violence (riots, suicides). What was the impact of education on society in, for example, the area of family life? Did the educational system in the Meiji period instill values that tended to disrupt traditional family life in order to release increasing numbers of laborers for Japan's industrialization? Irokawa Taikichi has been investigating the disintegration of the family during the Meiji period.

3. Conclusions

- a. If a balance in the treatment of Meiji intellectual history has been somewhat restored by the revisionist trend and by the concern with the impact of thought throughout society, much remains to be done on the nature and quality of intellectual change. We still need studies of the transition from the English and French thought of the early Meiji to the German idealism of the late Meiji.
- b. Basic to this problem is an examination of articulated thought and inner commitment, motivation and tension.
- c. To do so requires an examination of (1) industrial values and cultural identity, (2) alienation, (3) "the spirit of the times," and (4) reaction (nationalism).
- d. The quality and organization of mass education, the emergence of new religions, biography, literature and indices of violence may prove valuable areas in which to explore such problems.

IV. TAISHŌ-SHŌWA HISTORY

A. Social History

1. Remarks by George Wilson

There have been two basic trends in postwar treatments of Taishō and prewar Shōwa history: (1) to view Japan's trek to war as something less than a satanic conspiracy, and (2) to do for the Taishō-Shōwa period what has been done for the Meiji period. Hopefully, two more trends will develop: (1) finding the roots of continuities extending into the postwar period, and (2) giving more attention to the "traditional well-springs" of the Taishō-Shōwa period.

The following subjects require study:

- a. An evaluation of the 1930's as a break with prior history, especially economically. Group biographies allowing the use of computers on aggregate data would be especially useful.
- b. A re-evaluation of the Japanese petit bourgeoisie, especially in relation to the social origins of fascism in Japan.
- c. The study of intellectuals as groups.
- d. An intensive study of the military: background, recruitment, training, and values. Have army recruits, especially in the officer corps, been from rural areas as is commonly believed? Has the Shikan Gakkō (military academy) been decisive in forming officer attitudes?
- e. The traditional motivational framework of right-wing activists. What has "restoration" meant as a model for social action?

2. Discussion

Of special importance during this period is the study of elites and elite formation. How much role frustration existed in the military? During the immediate prewar period, nationalism had multiple manifestations. Generational attitudes, such as revealed in the "national youth group," and group orientations toward the nation need study. What were the attitudes of those living in the 1930's toward the 1920's? What were the shared generational perceptions at the base of social operations during the 1930's? Sources on the military during the 1930's include official rosters, curricula and journals. One major problem is that the German sources used by Japanese intellectuals have not been translated into English and are frequently unknown. Consequently our image of many prewar figures has been distorted; for example, Yoshino Sakuzo was not a "liberal" in the English model but a "kannen gakusha" (a scholar of ideas) in the German tradition.

Japan's period of "modernization" led to (1) the diplomacy of expansion, (2) wars, and (3) a critical role for men and arms. The assumptions of Taishō-Shōwa history all lead to the Pacific War. In this history Japanese perceptions of the outside world were decisive. In the 1930's Japanese perceptions shifted markedly from those of the previous decade toward a concern with "impersonal world forces" and away from treaties, disarmament and the atmosphere of "world peace" during the aftermath of World War I. The moral and ethical stance embodied in this shift in perceptions on war and diplomacy should be evaluated. At present, revisionist diplomatic history, as presented largely by European scholars, has addressed itself to the "hard" problems faced by the Japanese. We therefore need to address the old problems once again. For example, a re-evaluation of the civilian-military dichotomy, so critical to policy formation in the 1930's, is seriously needed. It was conservative civilian institutions, like the Privy Council, that were quite possibly the primary checks against a pure form of fascism emerging in Japan. In this respect, the role of the Diet also requires re-examination. Of equal importance is the study of intellectual groups, such as the Shōwa Kenkyūkai.

B. Political History

1. Remarks by T. Matsuo

Although the Taishō period has been notably neglected, having only Shinobu's three volume history as a leading study, work in Japan has begun in earnest. At Kyōtō University a Taishō study group is soon to publish Taishō Jidai no Seiji to Shakai, under the editorship of Inoue Kiyoshi. Nihon no Rekishi in the Iwanami Kōza series also looks into Taishō democracy. The C. S. Mondai Kenkyūkai (Christian Studies Problems Institute) also has a group studying the Taishō period. This is, however, the extent of major Japanese efforts.

Problems in studying the Taishō period center on (1) establishing a chronology for "Taishō democracy," (2) the impact and role of the mass media, and (3) social forces in the countryside. On chronology, Japanese historians date Taishō democracy from 1905 to 1924 while Japanese political scientists place Taishō democracy in the period 1918 (formation of the Hara Cabinet) to 1931 (the Manchurian Incident). Historians have chosen 1905 as a result of their quest for the origins of the social energy released in the Taishō period. In 1905 the anti-Portsmouth Treaty demonstrations and riots were part of a wider emergence of social forces. The most important manifestation of the new energies was the "second rights movement" of the 1920's. What groups were involved? What local forces? It was not until 1918 when the Kenseikai developed strong local (urban) support that two national parties

can be said to exist. But the Konseikai has received far less attention than the Seiyūkai.

Newspapers throughout the Taishō period were of tremendous importance but remain unstudied. Although Mr. Kinbara has made a start in the study of rural movements in the Taishō period his work is only a beginning.

2. Discussion

In structuring his conference on Taishō Japan to be held in January, Bernard Silberman has dated Taishō democracy from 1900 to 1935, using structural features of Japanese society as criteria. Parties, for example, remain important in Japanese political history well beyond 1924. Mr. Matsuo argued, however, that the dissolution of the Kaishintō in 1924 signalled a reorganization of political parties which would end the democratic movement in prewar Japan.

Why has Taishō democracy always been discussed as a domestic movement unconnected to the international world, the international trend toward "peace and democracy?" Diplomacy was certainly influenced by the internationalist "spirit of the times." After 1931 this atmosphere changed markedly. What are the discontinuities? Did the "Shōwa restoration" movement of the 1930's mean a paradoxical restoration of the new, rather than a return to the old, as in fact the Meiji Restoration did?

Topics in Taishō-Shōwa history requiring further study are:

- a. Mass communications and the emergence of mass society as depicted by William Kornhauser in his The Politics of Mass Society. Irwin Scheiner is currently working on mass society in Taishō Japan, including measurements of the level of mass society.
- b. Vertical history: the ties between local and national politics, social movements and groups.
- c. The "demodernization" process.
- d. The role and function of political participants in holding the policy-making process together.
- d. The relation between personality and social process.
- e. In postwar Shōwa history, the evolution of the triangular ties among businessmen, politicians and officials.

3. Conclusions

- a. The Taishō-Shōwa period has not received the attention that the Meiji period has, except possibly in the area of urban social movements.
- b. An examination of Taishō democracy in relation to the international "spirit of the times" is needed in addition to examining the traditional well-springs of behavior. The chronology of Taishō democracy may need revising in the light of generational perspectives on politics from Taishō until the Pacific War, perspectives which may reveal the nature and degree of discontinuity between the 1930's and 1920's.
- c. Examination of military-civilian relations is required, including (1) the military ethic, (2) right-wing renovationism, (3) bureaucratic organization and functioning, and (4) official conservatism.
- d. As in the previous periods and areas discussed thus far in the conference, the lack of thorough biographies has hampered the study of personality, role-playing, and the socialization process.

V. AN EXTRADISCIPLINARY VIEW

A. Remarks by Ezra F. Vogel

It is not the purpose of historians to answer a sociologist's requests for data to fill out his comparative models. It would be of great benefit to sociologists, however, if historians would fill out the social system of a given period so that sociologists could use it. For example, historians have not adequately described village leadership and community history, evidently because such history is peripheral to national changes. On the other hand, questions posed by sociologists have increasingly informed the work of historians.

If a sociologist were to set forth problem areas in Japanese history there would be basically two. First, knowledge is required on how the entire social system works at a given time. What, for example, is the degree of common culture? How do interests fit into that structure, as seen, for example, in attitudes toward political corruption? Where are the sources of strain in the interactions among the social components? Second, there has been very little use of organizational theory by historians. How does one describe the status of groups within an organization? Does skill differentiation produce status incongruity? The nature of sanctions (coer-

cive, remunerative, normative, integrative) might prove useful to historians in distinguishing group types.

B. Discussion

Sociologists can provide useful frameworks for historical inquiry. Without a historian's language skills and immersion in the history of a culture, however, the sociologist cannot develop meaningful theories about that culture. On the other hand, theories developed by sociologists--deVos on motivation, Erikson on identity, for example--might prove valuable tools for historical inquiry. Awareness of sociological theory might aid the historian in finding, for example, local community counterparts of the Genro in national politics. Modernization studies have benefited greatly from sociological theory.

Would personality theory be useful in historical biography? Are the kinds of materials available that would make such biographies possible?

IV. PROBLEMS OF TEACHING AND STUDENT RECRUITMENT

Recruiting promising students into the field of Japanese history poses a number of serious problems: (1) In terms of language skills and length of preparation required, a student must be prepared to invest great energy and time, especially in the field of premodern history. (2) Many students who enter the field are inspired by direct contact with Japan. Should means be found to provide potential students with such an experience? Should they first be tested by exposure to the language and then aided to travel to Japan as a "reward?" The Stanford Inter-University Program, headed by Kenneth Butler, is now in full operation in Tokyo and recruiting students for the academic year. International Christian University, Tokyo, as well as Sophia University, offer summer seminars. Round-trip airfare to the ICU seminar is provided by the Japan Society of New York. The Association for Asian Studies has also begun charter flight services to Japan. (3) What sacrifices to the student are involved in terms of a liberal education? Is it desirable to recruit students who do not have an adequate knowledge of Europe and the Western tradition? (4) Japan is not currently recognized as "a problem area" by some foundations. Given the time and energy required, where will financial support be found?

7d: ANNEX A

List of Participants

George M. Beckmann, Claremont Graduate School
Hugh Borton, Columbia University
Albert Craig, Harvard University
James B. Crowley, Yale University
Roger F. Hackett, University of Michigan
John W. Hall, Yale University
Harry D. Harootunian, University of Wisconsin
Dan Fenno Henderson, University of Washington
Akira Iriye, University of Rochester
Marius B. Jansen, Princeton University
Takayoshi Matsuo, Harvard University
Tetsuo Najita, University of Wisconsin
Frederick Notehelfer, University of California, Los Angeles
Kenneth B. Pyle, University of Washington
Donald H. Shively, Harvard University
Bernard S. Silberman, Duke University
David A. Titus, Wesleyan University
Ezra F. Vogel, Harvard University
Herschel F. Webb, Columbia University
George M. Wilson, Chairman, University of Indiana

APPENDIX 7e

Survey Conference on Premodern Japanese
History and Religion

New York City, April 18-19, 1969

I. INTRODUCTION

This is a report on a meeting of twenty Japanese and Western specialists in premodern Japanese history and religion, convened at the offices of the Social Science Research Council in New York on April 18-19, 1969, as one in a series sponsored by the ACLS-SSRC Joint Committee on Japanese Studies for the purpose of assessing the present state of the various fields of Japanese studies.

In the fall of 1968, the Joint Committee asked William McCullough of Stanford University to organize a survey conference on premodern Japanese history and religion. The two fields were felt to be closely enough related and the numbers of scholars few enough to make a single combined meeting useful and desirable. The chairman and a small group of colleagues first compiled a list of forty-two persons with relevant research or teaching interests and then selected twenty--a number determined by financial limitations--for participation in the conference (see Annex A). The participants, of whom seven were primarily religionists and thirteen were historians, came from fourteen colleges and universities in Japan, England, Germany, and the United States. To avoid overlap with an earlier conference on modern history, "premodern" was construed to mean "pre late Tokugawa."

The conference was organized into four sessions of approximately equal length, two devoted to research, one to teaching, and one to the development of conference themes.

Research. Although the discussion included a review of past achievements and current tendencies, principal attention was given to the identification of areas in which Western scholars hereafter might make the most useful and significant contributions. This involved, on the one hand, an assessment of needs--an attempt to specify subjects and problems believed to be particularly crucial for the furtherance of Western understanding in the field--and on the other hand, an appraisal of research opportunities especially suited to the disciplinary training and interests of Western scholars. In either case, distinction was made between the Western scholar's role as a transmitter of the results of Japanese research and his function as an independent researcher.

Prepared statements by H. Paul Varley (Columbia University), Horst Hammitzsch (Ruhr University), John Hall (Yale Uni-

versity), Joseph Kitagawa (Chicago University), Carmen Blacker (Cambridge University), and Abe Masao (Nara University) provided a framework for discussion in the research sessions.

Teaching. In the session on teaching, participants addressed themselves to a wide range of problems at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Chief interest centered on teaching methodology, curricular materials, and the relationship between methodology and materials. A special effort was made to catalogue some of the more critical needs for teaching materials and to suggest means by which the needs might best be met. Papers by Donald Shively and Masatoshi Nagatomi (both of Harvard University) served as points of departure for the discussion.

In the summary below, no attempt has been made to reproduce completely the variety of opinions and ideas that emerged at the conference. Only major trends and themes are traced. The order of the agenda is followed more closely than was actually the case in the conference itself, and informal discussions outside the regular sessions have been taken into account.

II. PROCEEDINGS

A. The Study of Premodern Japanese History

1. Present State of Research

A wide range of work has been done in the field by Western scholars, ranging through all periods of the premodern age and over many of the larger subjects areas of interest. Much of this work, or perhaps even most of it, is not properly characterized as original research. Translations account for a substantial portion, and much of the rest is based on studies by Japanese scholars. Work to date has, nevertheless, provided a significant beginning for Western studies, and in recent years the products of increasingly sophisticated original research have begun to appear.

The approaches of Western scholars to premodern Japanese history have been almost as diverse as the scholars themselves. General politico institutional and cultural history focused on the central ruling class is undoubtedly better represented than any other single area, but there also exists a scattering of completed or in progress specialized studies that seek to treat various aspects of premodern Japanese history from a more highly structured, disciplinary point of view. These include studies of local history, religion, economic development, governmental systems, legal institutions, and social organization. Western scholarship thus far has been distinguished from the Japanese primarily by its natural

predilection toward comparative statements and by a somewhat stronger aversion to theoretical constructs. The more recent specialized studies suggest, however, that greater independence in approach is developing. This involves (1) more emphasis on systematic comparisons between Japanese and European or Chinese history, and (2) a growing interest in the application of Western social science theory to the Japanese historical experience.

2. Research Needs

From the point of view of the non-Japanese-reading academic audience in the West, the list of general and specific research desiderata for premodern Japanese history is practically inexhaustible. The conference's survey of the accomplishments of Western specialists served primarily to point up the enormous lacunae in Western language studies in virtually every area of the field. This is not to say, however, that the field as a whole is undeveloped, or that the volume of research is low, since Japanese work on premodern Japanese history is rich in quantity and impressive in achievement. It was felt, therefore, that one of the most urgent needs is to make available to Western students and scholars the principal findings of Japanese researchers. Two means of doing this were suggested: (1) translation of key articles and monographs by Japanese scholars; and (2) synthetic studies based primarily on Japanese research.

It was pointed out that synthetic studies might grow naturally out of a Western scholar's own research work, but that translation, or adaptation into a Western language, would involve a different kind of work and an extra investment of time that perhaps few specialists would be willing to undertake.

a. Land Tenure and Use. Japanese research on land tenure and use in the premodern era has been prolific and of high quality, especially in the post-World-War-II period, but very little of this work has been introduced in any depth to Western students. It was felt by many at the conference that comprehensive, detailed studies of the evolution of the shōen and its associated institutions constitute perhaps the most pressing basic need in the field. Such studies, it was hoped, would provide not only generalized statements on the shōen at each stage of its development, but also enough specific treatment of individual shōen to give substance to abstractions and to document the variety of particular cases. Comparisons with European feudal land tenure were noted as an obviously fruitful avenue of approach, although a caveat was interposed against hasty comparisons based on inadequate understanding of the Japanese data.

b. Political Organization. Although the various types of political structures in premodern Japan have received

considerable attention from Western scholars, there is still an urgent need for extended descriptive and analytical studies in every period and at every level. Even the formal structure of central political institutions--the ritsuryō court, sekkan power, insei government, and the succeeding bakufu--is for the most part only imperfectly represented in Western scholarly writings, while attempts at analysis of the dynamics of political power remain, with a few exceptions, rudimentary. It was noted that there are adequate source materials for rewarding studies of local political organization from the 13th century on.

c. Legal Institutions. Some progress in the study of premodern Japanese legal institutions has been made, or is being made, by Western scholars, but much remains to be done before there is adequate treatment of each period. Basic descriptive studies of statutory and customary law and legal processes were seen as perhaps the first prerequisite for each period, but there is also need for more generalized analysis of legal concepts and of the premodern concept of law itself. Since the ritsuryō kyakushiki legal system of the Nara and Heian periods was basic to the development of most early Japanese legal thought and practice, it was felt that particular encouragement should be given to the development of studies in that field.

d. Foreign Relations. Western scholars have written extensively on the appearance of Europeans in Japan during the 16th and 17th centuries, but they have paid much less attention to the more fundamental historical problem of Japanese relations with China and Korea. Cultural, intellectual, and economic contacts with the continent were important, and sometimes determining, forces in the shaping of Japanese history during all premodern periods, but Western-language studies of the contacts are few in number and limited in scope. Comprehensive studies of the nature, extent, and impact of Japanese relations with China and Korea are needed, therefore, across the whole range of the premodern era, but the need is perhaps especially acute for the 7th to 9th centuries and for post-Kamakura times.

e. Agriculture, Industry, and Commerce. Of the numerous gaps in Western-language writing on premodern Japanese history, perhaps none is more conspicuous than the one in the area of production and the circulation of goods. While this reflects in part the limitations placed on research by the poverty of relevant sources for most of the world, much useful work has been accomplished by Japanese scholars on the development of agricultural techniques, the evolution of manufacturing industries, and the development of mechanisms of trade, including the itinerant merchant and the periodic market. Here the post-Kamakura period offers the most promising field of study.

f. Social Organization. Although Japanese study of the premodern period is perhaps least developed and least satisfactory in the field of sociological description and analysis, some significant research has been done. Useful synthetic studies are presently feasible, for example, on such subjects as religious institutions, military organization, and elite ruling groups. It is the area of familial institutions and organization, however, that has probably been best developed by Japanese scholars and is most in need of attention by Western scholars. A satisfactory Western-language account of uji organization, functions, and development was singled out as a particularly important requirement.

3. Research Opportunities

The conference's survey of Japanese research revealed not only great richness, but also certain weaknesses and imbalances that offer the Western scholar particularly favorable opportunities for original research. The opportunities have to do in part with particular types of problems or topics, and in part with approach and discipline.

It was noted that Japanese preoccupation with Marxist historiography has led to a heavy emphasis on formal, impersonal studies of classes, mechanisms, structures, and systems, at the expense of concern with individual human beings. Japanese scholars have not altogether ignored the individual in history, but the subject has usually been tangential to the main line of scholarly interest, as if it were not quite respectable, and the best minds typically have not concerned themselves with it. This neglect of biography results in a distorted view of historical development in Japan, not only because it deals inadequately with the impact that individuals may have on events, but also in the sense that history without biography is a form of taxidermy (to paraphrase Lasswell), preserving the object but saying little about it as a living organism. It is necessary, therefore, insofar as sources permit, to place biography squarely in the mainstream of premodern history in Japan. The retardation of Japanese scholarship in this respect has left Western specialists a significant field of research, and one that is in urgent need of development.

Japanese research on premodern social, political, economic, and religious institutions has tended to remain on a similarly formal, abstract level, ignoring the operational dynamics of the institution being studied. Scholars should now move beyond this type of static analysis and concern themselves with the actual functioning of institutions and their interrelationships. We know, for instance, a good deal about the formal characteristics of the organization and operation of Buddhist temples and Shinto shrines, but we have neither a clear picture of the day-to-day functioning of the various kinds of religious institutions, nor an integrated view of the

intersection between these institutions and society as a whole. The relationship between membership and hierarchy in the priesthood, on the one hand, and family institutions and organization, on the other, is a simple example of the important inter-institutional connections that have been only imperfectly explored by Japanese scholars.

Intellectual history constitutes another relatively unworked research area in which the Western scholar may expect to make important contributions. Here again the tendency of the Japanese researcher has been to concentrate on isolated aspects of the subject, insofar as he has treated it at all, and to provide only fragmentary, highly disjointed glimpses of the intellectual activity of an age. More specialized research is clearly needed in all spheres of premodern thought, but, more than that, we need integrated studies of the various strands of thought and kinds of beliefs that came together in individuals to form specific types of intellectual outlooks. The materials for such studies are admittedly difficult to put together and to interpret, since the premodern Japanese were usually not given to explicit formulations of general intellectual views. For this reason, collaborative efforts between Japanese and Western scholars--which the conference felt to be highly desirable in all fields--might be particularly useful and rewarding in the area of intellectual history.

In addition to specific subjects in which the Western scholar has an opportunity to contribute to the study of premodern Japanese history, there are disciplinary approaches that promise to be perhaps even more rewarding in terms of original research. These involve the social sciences, especially anthropology, sociology, psychology, and political science.

Within the last decade or two, the modern social sciences have achieved fairly widespread acceptance by Western historians as helpful tools of analysis in their field. Since Japanese historians have not made significant use of these disciplines (except in the case of economics), the Westerner has an opportunity to introduce a wide range of powerful new analytical concepts. Not all of the methodology and tools developed by anthropologists, psychologists, sociologists, and political scientists are equally relevant to research on premodern Japanese history--the nature of the sources, for instance, would generally preclude complex quantitative studies--but there are few areas in which these disciplines could not make some worthwhile contribution, and in many cases their application would undoubtedly result in new and revolutionary insights.

The view was taken that it is probably through the social sciences that the historian can achieve the most systematic and structured approach to comparative studies of Japanese history. Indeed, unless the historian employs the

universal, generalized concepts and theories that the social scientist has sought to establish, or unless he follows some large-scale historical schematization of the Marxian type, comparison of historical experiences becomes essentially a random process, offering insights into particular phenomena only in a more or less fortuitous fashion. Thus application of the conceptual frameworks developed to analyze individual and group behavior can greatly increase the chances that comparative work on premodern Japanese society will be systematic and directed toward significant, genuinely comparable features. In the same way, comparisons of the Japanese and European aristocracies can be much more meaningful if they make conscious, expert use of sociological notions about social stratification, social mobility, status discrepancy, and the like.

The use of social science theory for comparative historical study was recognized as merely one illustration of the role that the social sciences can play in sharpening and deepening historical analysis at almost every level. A number of specific topics were suggested in which the application of social science theory and techniques could be expected to produce significant results. Study of the family, marriage, and the kinship order through sociological concepts, for instance, would lead not only to new insights about the nature of the institutions themselves, but also to a better understanding of the surrounding economic and political systems. Theories and concepts of political power, social role, career lines, political elites, sibling order, and market structures were also suggested as having possibilities for a multitude of fruitful applications in one or another aspects of premodern Japanese history. In some cases these approaches may raise new questions for the historian, such as the relationship between birth order and career development among the Heian aristocracy, or the social role of the priesthood in military families. In other cases they may shed light on old problems--for example, a consideration of stratification structure might refine the present conception of the relationship between imperial authority and military power.

B. The Study of Premodern Religion

1. Present State of Research

Serious study of premodern Japanese religion in the United States was characterized as being still in its infancy. A few broad studies of Japanese religion as a whole, a handful of more specialized works on particular religions and sects, individual religious leaders, and other miscellaneous subjects, and a few translations of religious texts account for most of the significant work that has been done. The situation is not materially improved when European scholarship is included.

Since World War II, premodern religionists have worked in two principal areas of interest: (1) Buddhist doctrinal studies and church history, which were the chief interests of pre-war Western writers; and (2) comparative religion, which represents generally a new approach, since the comparison is founded not solely on Christian norms, as it tended to be before the war, but on more universal concepts of religious experience.

2. Research Needs

The discussion of existing Western studies on the subject of premodern Japanese religion made it clear--if clarification were necessary--that the need for Western-language research is unlimited. As in the case of premodern history, however, there is a large amount of significant Japanese work that may be translated or synthesized to meet much of the need. The following general fields were suggested as perhaps the most promising from this point of view.

a. Buddhist Doctrine. Despite the key importance of Buddhist doctrine to virtually all phases of premodern Japanese religious history, qualified Western scholars have done very little to exploit Japanese work in this area. Both general and specialized studies are required for the entire premodern era, but the need is perhaps especially critical for the Kamakura and pre-Kamakura periods, when the groundwork was laid for much of the later doctrinal development. Tendai, Taishin, Shingon, and the development of Amidist thought were mentioned as areas requiring particular attention.

b. Buddhist Church History. Histories of the great Buddhist temples and of the Buddhist priesthood are needed by the general historian and the religious historian alike. Without reliable treatment of priests as individuals and as members of groups, and of the organization and functioning of temples, our concept of Buddhism as a living religion will remain grossly distorted. Although no priorities were suggested, it was pointed out that Japanese scholars have probably given most attention to the lives of leading priests.

c. Popular Religious Practices. Japanese religionists have grown increasingly interested in the study of religion as it was actually practiced by the general populace and by popular leaders in Japan. The results of their research in this traditionally neglected area provide an altogether new concept of the role and meaning of religion in premodern Japan and should be made available to Western readers at the earliest opportunity. The nature of the sources has tended to direct attention to the later parts of the premodern era, but even for the earlier periods significant work has been done on the basis of the religious practices and beliefs found among the ruling classes.

3. Research Opportunities

It was felt by some conference participants that the Western scholar's most important opportunity for original contributions arises from his relative objectivity, which allows him to approach a subject without the religious prejudices, preconceptions, and involvements of his Japanese counterpart. This is particularly important because most of the native writing is done by adherents or ex-adherents of one or another of the Buddhist sects. Apart from this, it appears that Japanese and Westerners see more or less eye-to-eye in matters of subject and approach; and future Western research, therefore, may be expected generally to parallel the work of Japanese scholars.

Among the participants themselves, two major interests were evident. One group, concerned primarily with Buddhism as the major premodern formal religious tradition, saw doctrinal and church history studies as basic not only to the history of Buddhism in Japan, but also to the whole of Japanese religious history. Members of the other group, whose focus of interest was on the shifting amalgam of religious belief and practice that constituted religion on the mass level in Japan (the so-called "little tradition"), recognized the fundamental importance of doctrine and church history but stressed the question of the precise nature of religion in Japan in its widest scope or most general meaning--what was its effect and how did it operate throughout the society?

C. The Teaching of Premodern Japanese History and Religion in Universities and Colleges

1. Teaching Materials and Methods in Premodern History

The conference's survey in this area found that texts and other materials for both introductory and advanced courses ranged mostly from inadequate to nonexistent, and that the situation imposed severe limitations on teaching methodology and course content.

a. Introductory Courses. "Introductory" was taken to refer to an initial course dealing exclusively or mainly with the premodern period. It was pointed out that present surveys of premodern Japanese history are either too brief (Reischauer and Fairbank's East Asia: The Great Tradition) or out of date (Sansom's books), and that very few specialized studies are available to supplement and expand such treatments. This means, in terms of teaching methodology, that despite current student criticism of lecture courses, the instructor must rely heavily on lectures to compensate for the deficiencies of his texts. Discussion sessions are necessarily limited in utility and interest, and the lectures themselves must usually remain on an elementary factual and interpretive level. Detailed and comprehensive survey texts are thus essential if student dis-

cussion is to be made more fruitful and teachers are to have greater flexibility in designing lectures. It was suggested that at least two or three fairly weighty volumes, of perhaps 1,000 pages each, would be required to cover the entire pre-modern period. The proposed Cambridge history series on Japan was noted as a possible answer to this need.

Other types of teaching materials were mentioned as additional requirements for introductory courses: (1) collections of translated sources, similar to Sources of Japanese Tradition, but with the principal focus on important historical documents, edicts, laws, etc.; (2) detailed chronological tables extending over the entire period; (3) a reliable historical dictionary of important people, places, events, and terminology; and (4) more detailed course syllabi of the type prepared by Varley. It was noted that visual materials for the teaching of premodern Japanese history are in generally good supply. These include well illustrated books on Japanese art and architecture, cinema films, and a variety of slide series made for use in Japanese schools.

b. Advanced Courses. On more advanced levels of instruction, there are two main types of courses: those in which Western-language materials are assigned for study, and those in which Japanese-language materials are used.

Most courses based on Western-language materials are either (1) specialized lecture courses devoted to a single period or subject or (2) reading and discussion courses designed for comprehensive coverage of significant Western work in the whole area of premodern history (usually for the benefit of graduate students preparing for qualifying examinations). In either case, the need for teaching materials is of about the same order and kind as the need for research in the field generally.

When instruction involves use of Japanese-language materials, the primary concern may be either (1) language learning and practice or (2) the content of the materials read. Courses falling into the first category include (a) those in which the student reads modern Japanese historians (usually considered fourth- or fifth-year courses in modern Japanese) and (b) those in which he studies historical documents. Teaching materials designed for both (a) and (b) have appeared in the Yamagiwa series of "Readings" texts, but they are far from adequate, especially for the study of historical documents. It was proposed that the first priority here should be the compilation of a representative collection of documents, chosen from all premodern periods and styles, and provided with clear, reliable treatments of grammar and vocabulary. Since several conference participants have already prepared partial sets of such materials for their own courses, a cooperative venture might be the most efficient method of producing an adequate text.

The active use of Japanese materials for their content is restricted largely to seminars and to courses on bibliography and research methods. Aside from the continuing need to update and improve presently available introductory bibliographical guides, no special needs for teaching materials were noted for instruction at this level.

In connection with the general problem of teaching premodern Japanese history, it was pointed out that an effective way of enriching the quality of instruction available to Western students is to make use of visiting Japanese historians as course and seminar instructors. The rising level of student linguistic competence makes this possible even when, as is usually the case, the Japanese scholar's knowledge of the appropriate Western language is inadequate for classroom purposes. If the instruction is conducted wholly or partially in Japanese, it not only provides new knowledge and new perspectives for the Western student, but also prepares him for academic work in Japan.

2. Teaching Materials in Premodern Religion

The needs for teaching materials in premodern Japanese religion generally parallel those in premodern history. Conference participants attached particular emphasis to two specific desiderata: a survey text and a source book.

As with the surveys of premodern history, existing surveys of premodern religion are either too short for courses devoted entirely to the subject (Kitagawa's Religion in Japanese History) or both too short and too far out of date (Anesaki's books). There is thus an urgent need for a detailed, comprehensive survey text covering all aspects of the premodern Japanese religious experience--one that will deal with doctrinal developments and church history, and that will also take full account of (1) the popular manifestations of religion on all levels and (2) the political, economic, and social factors involved in the shaping of religious developments. A special plea was made for the view that general history and religious history should not be treated in isolation from each other, either in teaching or in the writing of texts. A confocal, synthetic approach is necessary, both to achieve genuine understanding of Japanese religious developments and to meet the needs of social scientists and students of Religionswissenschaft.

Of perhaps equal importance for the teaching of premodern religion, it was suggested, is the production of a source book of translations from significant religious documents. This would include not only such obvious items as sacred texts and doctrinal treatises, but also non-scriptural works having to do with all varieties of religious belief and practices.

In connection with the need for a survey text and source book, it was noted that students should also have a work treating key terms in the Japanese religious vocabulary, especially technical Buddhist terminology.

Attention was called to the survey of non-Western religious studies in the United States now being prepared for ACLS by Joseph Kitagawa.

3. Student Recruitment and Teacher Placement

The conference made no attempt to gather statistical information on students, teachers, and courses in premodern Japanese religion and history, since the fields are so small that the personal knowledge and impressionistic assessments of those present were thought likely to be more reliable than results obtained from questionnaires. In the United States, almost all of the history and religion courses dealing exclusively with the premodern period in Japan are probably taught by conference participants, and their students account for most of those specializing in the two fields. On this basis, it was estimated that there are perhaps twenty to twenty-five scholars in the United States whose principal interests lie in the area of premodern Japanese history and religion, and that graduate students in the fields number, at the most, less than forty, with Ph.D. completions at the rate of no more than two or three a year. Since the age level of the scholars is relatively low and retirements few, the small number of Ph.D.'s results, nevertheless, in gradual expansion on the faculty level. It is clear that thus far, at any rate, the supply of premodern historians and religionists has not caught up with the demand. None of the participants reported difficulty in placing students, and several noted that they had received more requests for recommendations than they were able to meet with names of qualified students.

It was agreed that one of the principal obstacles to the expansion of premodern Japanese studies is the linguistic hurdle the student faces. As a result of postwar progress in teaching methods, it is now reasonable to expect three or four years of study to give students a genuinely usable knowledge of modern Japanese, assuming that one of the years is spent in a program like that offered by the Inter-University Center for Japanese Language Studies in Tokyo, but this is only the beginning for the would-be premodernist. As a minimum, he also needs to acquire competence in two or more kinds of classical literary Japanese and an equal variety of kambun styles; and if his field is religion he must usually come to grips with Sanskrit and Chinese Buddhist texts as well. At the very least, therefore, the student in one of these fields must devote an additional two or three years to language training, thus postponing his degree and lagging far behind his contemporaries in the development of his scholarly career. The conference had no specific answer to the problem, but there was a

strong feeling that one of the most effective ways to promote premodern Japanese studies in the West would be to work actively toward better teaching methods and materials in classical Japanese and kambun courses.

7e: ANNEX A

List of Conference Participants

Masao Abe, Nara University
 Carmen Blacker, Cambridge University
 H. Byron Earhart, Western Michigan University
 George S. Elison, Colby College
 John W. Hall, Yale University
 Horst Hammitzsch, Ruhr University
 Marius B. Jansen, Princeton University
 Tetsuo Kamiki, Kobe University
 Cornelius J. Kiley, University of Chicago
 Joseph Kitagawa, University of Chicago
 Helen McCullough, Stanford University
 William McCullough, Stanford University
 V. Dixon Morris, University of Hawaii
 Masatoshi Nagatomi, Harvard University
 Donald H. Shively, Harvard University
 H. Paul Varley, Columbia University
 Herschel F. Webb, Columbia University
 Stanley Weinstein, Yale University
 Philip B. Yampolsky, Columbia University
 Ivan I. Morris, Columbia University

Staff: Kay K. Ryland, Social Science Research Council
 David A. Titus, Wesleyan University
 Martin Weinstein, Columbia University

APPENDIX 7f

Conference on the Status of Studies
in Japanese Literature

June 5-6, 1969, SSRC, New York

I. INTRODUCTION

In June 1968 Robert Brower of the University of Michigan accepted the chairmanship of the subcommittee on Japanese literature. With the assistance of the subcommittee, Mr. Brower arranged a conference on the status of studies in Japanese literature, to be held on June 5-6, 1969. The conference, reported here, was attended by 27 specialists in Japanese literary studies and one member of the Joint Committee staff (see Annex A).

II. JAPANESE LITERARY STUDIES IN JAPAN

A. Remarks by Jinichi Konishi

The German philological tradition was the first school of modern literary analysis with which Japan came in contact. The influence of that tradition, which arrived in Japan during the middle of the Meiji period, strongly permeates Japanese literary studies today. Although a "Japanese literary arts" approach (Nihon bungeigaku) stressing historical and critical treatment was advocated from the 1930's onward, it was not recognized as the mainstream of Japanese literary studies; nor did the exponents of Nihon bungeigaku by any means repudiate the traditions of Literaturwissenschaft. After World War II there were also prolific attempts to explain Japanese literature and arts by applying the concepts of historical materialism, but from around 1950 on this trend has declined. Japanese Marxists, of course, can also be seen as yet another branch of a "German school" of literary scholarship in Japan. The dominant influence in modern Japanese literary studies has thus remained the German tradition.

Within the German tradition there appear to be two weakly connected elements, or characteristics: (1) the insistence on precision of facts, as seen in philology, textual criticism, and biography; and (2) a penchant for Idealism, giving rise to majestic romanticism and philosophical speculation on the nature of ideas. The gap between the two was widened and the connection made weaker in Japan. Prior to the Restoration of 1868, Japan had already developed a tradition of precise textual and factual research in literary studies, as exemplified by the writings of Motoori Norinaga (1730-1801) in the Edo

period. Logical treatment based on systematic analysis, however, was weak. Thus Japanese scholars were especially receptive to German Philologie with its systematic textual criticism. As a result, bibliographical and biographical research and textual criticism advanced rapidly in Japan, especially from the 1920's. On the other hand, since speculation regarding the "Japanese spirit" had also existed from the Edo period, efforts were made toward its systematization in accordance with the German theoretical tradition. But because the connection between precise textual research and analysis of ideas was even weaker in Japan, the study of a given literary work frequently leapt suddenly from the former to the latter. Detailed inquiry into the work itself, the intermediate link, was lacking. Textual notation was abundant, but there was little analysis of the means and ends of literary expression: images, metaphors, symbols, and the emotional response they evoke in the reader. Despite ample opportunity, Japanese scholars did not attempt to incorporate into their work approaches current in non-German Western literary criticism. Perhaps the main reason for this was that before World War II Japanese scholars of Japanese literature focused mainly on the classics: the study of Meiji (and post-Meiji) literature was left largely to "amateurs." The communication between the two groups has gradually improved since the 1950's and continues to do so. Scholars of Japanese literature can no longer neglect the activities of Japanese scholars of Western literature, who are devoting increasing attention to Japanese literature as well. It is to be hoped that through their efforts some of the practices of English, American and French literary criticism will be applied to the study of Japanese literature in Japan. This would no doubt help to loosen the stiff joints that have for so long hobbled Japanese literary studies.

Given their preference for philology and textual criticism, Japanese scholars have naturally tended to neglect work done in the West on Japanese literature--work in which literary criticism is stressed, by and large. Recently, however, greater attention has been paid to Western studies of Japanese literature. For example, the magazine Kokubungaku established a column entitled "studies of Japanese literature in the West," which introduces Western works on Japanese literature almost every month. Yet for the most part this attention is of a rather cursory nature. Few, if any, Japanese scholars would consider revising their own basic approach on the strength of Western arguments, no matter how closely they might have followed these arguments.

Japanese interest in Western studies of Japanese literature stems mainly, perhaps, from a simple curiosity about how the "blue eyes" look at it. Underlying this curiosity is the unexamined assumption that, fundamentally, Westerners cannot be expected to understand Japanese literature in particular, or "things Japanese" in general. James Araki's study of Japan's medieval ballad drama and Kenneth Butler's article on

Heike Monogatari, to mention but two examples, show that Westerners are indeed capable of creative historical and critical research, of the sort that Japanese themselves value so highly. And other Western scholars, such as Robert Brower, Howard Hibbett and Earl Miner, have adopted in their works perspectives which are quite new to most Japanese scholars, thus contributing greatly to our understanding of our own literature. When Japanese scholars must look to such works as references in their own research we are certainly beyond the stage where the color of the eyes has any meaning.

In what areas can Japanese and Western scholars of Japanese areas best cooperate? Japanese scholars of the Kokubungaku tradition, because of their long experience in preparing dictionaries, indexes and variorum editions for the production of sound and readily understandable texts, could contribute significantly to Western scholarship in those areas. Indeed this is precisely what the Kokubungakusha consider to be their prime professional responsibility (though it is not, needless to say, specifically undertaken for the benefit of Western scholars). Beyond this, perhaps Japanese scholars could on occasion make a special effort to elucidate particular matters which non-Japanese scholars might find especially difficult to understand or interpret. The point is not that the "blue eyes" cannot understand things Japanese; this they have done in many an instance. But cooperation with Japanese scholars would certainly ease the difficulties and inconveniences encountered.

On the other hand, there are elements, such as those embodied in the Zen tradition, that are extremely difficult for Japanese scholars themselves to understand, not to mention Western scholars. Zen must be understood, however, because it is from Zen that Japanese arts and letters have drawn some of their most distinctive characteristics. Although Zen has attracted a considerable following among some Westerners, particularly among Americans, it would not be too much of an exaggeration to state that Zen is only superficially understood. There are plenty of "blue-eyed Zenists." The basic problem which Zen poses to the literary scholar is that it explicitly denies all rational (logical) thought. Both Westerners and present day Japanese, being rational creatures, deliberately attempt to understand irrational Zen through rational means alone. But according to the Zen scheme, Truth is comprehended only in the eighth and final stage of understanding, a stage somewhat resembling the "subconscious" of the psychoanalysts. At this stage (Sanskrit: ālayavijñāna; Japanese: arayashiki --sometimes translated as "storehouse consciousness"), understanding transcends the modes of everyday human comprehension, the "normal" rational and emotional processes alike. As is well-known, Zen seeks to break down these normal processes by means of non-sequiturs and other "irrational" statements and actions. Beyond this, though, the Zen masters and their disciples, including lay artists, poets, and others, strive to

express the higher order of truth in a more positive fashion. Since by definition such Truth cannot be transmitted logically or through an explicit appeal to the emotions, it is a simple, and often stark, image--a basic unit of all literary and artistic creation--which is employed most frequently to communicate Truth. The image in Zen creates a spiritual focus by means of which the self is united to the object of the image. For instance, in the typically terse phrase "willows: green; flowers: red," there is no attempt to explicate the meaning of the images. They are simply set forth, evoking the deeply felt greenness of the willows and the redness of the flowers--and the spiritual experience of being one with these things. While in the widest sense the Zen image is used to "symbolize" cosmic Truth, this is not the same as what in the West is called symbolism. A symbol, as used in the West, combines the "tenor" being symbolized and the "image" or "vehicle" used for the purpose of symbolizing. In Zen, a symbol has only a vehicle; it has no tenor.

The "tenorless symbolism" of Zen might be strange to a Westerner, but it has its origin in the origins of Zen itself. The techniques of attaining higher consciousness employed by the Zen masters--broadly speaking, their "epistemology"--are based on the teachings of the Tendai sect, while their ontology owes much to the tenets of the Kegon sect. Following the Tendai practice of "concentration and insight" (*shikan*: the Sino-Japanese translation for the Sanskrit term transliterated as "Zen"), they seek to focus sensory experience on a single phenomenon, which is considered to be equivalent to all other phenomena in the universe. Zen does not, however, hold with the Tendai teaching that all phenomena (*shi*) are merely transitory manifestations of abiding noumena or principles (*ri*) which can only be comprehended through this practice of meditation. Rather, it adheres to the Kegon view that the phenomena themselves--or more precisely, their inter-relationships--represent ultimate reality. Consequently, Zen insists only on grasping the individual "thing" itself, and not on Truth in the form of abstract principles arrived at through rational processes. The Zen image, then, eliminates tenor, since tenor is in fact an abstract principle, and tries to make Truth understood directly and profoundly through the object or thing itself. This is the origin of the tenorless symbolism that is Zen's distinctive characteristic, and it is this Zen concept that makes Japan's arts and letters so distinctively "Japanese." The fourteenth century Waka poet Kyōgoku Tamekane (1254-1332) and his school used tenorless symbolism, for example, in focusing on scenic description, with no mention of ideas, in order precisely to achieve the impression of great expanse, expanse that words could not explain and that suggested a communion with the entire universe. Tenorless symbolism is also a distinctive feature of the Nō drama.

In the preface to his Japanese Literature, Donald Keene states that he chose his selections on the basis of what ap-

pealed to him, sacrificing the inclusion of some masterpieces acclaimed by both Japanese and Western critics alike. Among the selections he did make, from the Kokinshū to the Haikai of Bashō, works in the tradition of tenorless symbolism are conspicuously included. Such a strikingly perceptive selection might have been easier for Keene to arrive at than for Japanese scholars of literature precisely because he is not Japanese. He was able to grasp the distinctiveness of Japanese literature because the Zen element is not characteristic of Western arts and letters. It is by giving expression to and highlighting those elements in Japanese literature which Japanese themselves let pass unexplained or take for granted that Western scholars quite possibly make their greatest contribution to Japan. It sometimes happens that the "blue eyes" see Japan better than do the Japanese.

B. Remarks by Hajime Shinoda

In Japan one does not find works on Western literature that compare with or can be valued on the same plane as those produced in Western countries. Japanese scholars who work with the hope of achieving such standards are few indeed. Moreover, Japanese students of Western literature ask themselves: in what way can our research contribute to literary studies in Japan? Concretely the answer comes down to translation and criticism. Thus the complete works of Paul Valery, prepared to a degree of perfection never achieved even in his native France, were published in Japan. Before the war, Edmund Wilson and others noted that translations of Valery and Proust had been accomplished in Japan. Most literary critics active today in Japanese literary circles are, in fact, students of Western literature.

With this situation in mind, let us turn to the state of "national literature" (kokubungaku) in Japan. As a student of Western literature I can only look at Japanese literature from a distance, but allow me as an amateur to offer two or three observations.

As has often been said, scholars of Japanese literature in Japan have been overly concerned with the "philological method." Though this method has been criticized, individual scholars have no intention of abandoning it. Since experiencing the work itself is both the starting and the end point, to read a given text under the best possible conditions is the critical necessity. In this respect the philological method is an indispensable and powerful tool in restoring the true meaning of the text. It is impossible to think of literary research in scientific terms without this approach, precisely because of the logical structure which in theory infuses it. The importation of the philological method in the Meiji period has led to such texts as the Iwanami Nihon Koten Bungaku Taikei, to choose a very recent example. Although not all the texts in the Taikei are of high quality, the series compara-

tively speaking is nothing short of superb. The Taiki is but one of many works published in Japan that represent a truly great victory for the philological method in literary studies. Not only is it useful in textual analysis but also in illuminating such basic problems in literary studies as historical origins, style, and the personal histories of the writers themselves.

Because of its scientific premises, however, such a method does tend to get out of hand. There is almost no opportunity to exercise one's individual aesthetic judgment, since the philological methodologists often view literary studies based on one's aesthetic sensibility as purely arbitrary. And this is the most vexing problem facing present literary studies in general. In Japan and the rest of the world it would appear that the more developed the philological method, the more neglected the considerations of what makes a literary work a literary work. The debate between the philological school and its critics, such as the "new criticism," is world-wide. But here we must set aside the universal dimension of the problem and focus on the particular, or rather unique, situation of Japanese literary studies in Japan.

The study of the national literature in modern terms was begun around the turn of the century by a group of scholars led by Haga Yaichi (1867-1927) of Tokyo Imperial University. While a student in Germany, Haga accepted the German method of analyzing classical Western literature, considering it the best way to advance literary studies scientifically in Japan as well. In its origins, therefore, Japanese national literature studies were part and parcel of Japan's modernization, part of Japan's adoption of the best in the West. But literary studies do not belong to the same category as shipbuilding. It is inconceivable that the philological method developed by the German school of classical literary studies, based as it was on the characteristics of ancient Greek, could have much validity when applied to ancient Japanese literature with its own unique traditions and linguistic heritage. Aware of this problem, Haga singled out in the tradition of Japanese literary studies that which was most analogous to the German method. This was the "national scholarship" method begun by Keichū (1640-1701) and perfected by Motoori Norinaga (1730-1801). Although this was the most analogous, the national literature scholars did not separate literature and religion, treating religious classics as works of literature; whereas the distinction between the two was clearly recognized among German classicists. Haga saw only the superficial analogy between the German philological school and the Japanese national literature tradition. Technically he and his school developed the philological method to a high degree of sophistication by making method supreme. But the critical spirit, though present in the method of analysis, did not extend to the question of the literature itself.

If the absence of an all-pervading critical spirit was the first peculiar characteristic of Japanese national literature studies, there was also a second: a failure on the part of modern Japanese literary critics and writers to see the close connection between modern literature in Japan and the literary tradition of the fatherland. Modern Japanese writers bravely turned their backs on the traditional literature of previous ages and modelled themselves in various Western literary traditions. This denial of the past by modern writers and critics alike continues to the present. Although it should be the duty of Japanese scholars and critics to bring the classics back to life in the "here and now," very few, if any, can do so. The unhealthy estrangement of the classics from modern Japanese literature makes the state of Japanese literature extremely unstable and is one cause for the ossification of Kokubungaku. Scholars of classical Japanese literature and modern literary critics are isolated from each other in the world of Japanese literature.

Since the end of World War II in particular, however, modern Japanese literature is finding its place. A history of modern literature from the Meiji period on can now be written, though there are immense problems of selection and evaluation. For this purpose it is essential to have a background in Western literature, which the Kokubungakusha simply do not have. Since the War, the study of ancient and medieval literature has also been opened to free inquiry, and active debate over the Kojiki and Nihonshoki has become possible. Studies of Japanese writers in the Chinese mode are gradually emerging as well, studies, for example, such as that on Japanese poets by Fujikawa, Edoki no Kanshijin. But the philological method still dominates Japanese literary studies. In the post-war period its most influential opponent has been the school of historical sociology, based on Marxism. But the content of the Marxist school's works has not equalled the school's outward show of activity, since Marxist literary criticism is but one link in the chain of a special kind of historical research, and lacks literary sensitivity.

A genuinely Japanese literature cannot be hoped for, however, unless unity can be restored between Kokubungaku and present day Japanese literature. The responsibility for this lies primarily with students of modern Japanese literature, for it was modern Japanese literature that disavowed the past.

C. Discussion

Though there is a Japanese bias against Western studies of Japanese literature it is flattering that Japanese should even read such studies, for whatever reasons. However looked down upon, moreover, bunkengaku (the philological method), with its concern for textual analysis and factual description, is very useful to Western scholars. In modern literature the comprehensiveness of Japanese publications of a given author's com-

plete works as well as the thoroughness of biographies are extremely valuable.

For the benefit of Western scholars, more might be done by Japanese scholars in the preparation of textbooks, in Japanese, that could be used by both Western and Japanese teachers of Japanese literature. In the area of coverage, certain periods and works are thoroughly covered while others are much neglected. The prolific work on the Manyōshū is an example of literary overkill; commentaries of Waka of other periods, however, are few and thin. In addition to fads, Japanese literary studies are influenced by the "will of the publisher." Collaboration between Japanese and Western scholars, being a more academic enterprise, might be most fruitful on the neglected or stereotyped figures in literature, such as Ki no Kaion (1663-1742), the reputed but currently unread rival of Chikamatsu. Greater concern with explanatory annotation, rather than pedestrian notation of the obvious, is also needed. Finally, more literary criticism, as opposed to philological and conceptual analysis, would be welcomed.

III. JAPANESE LITERARY STUDIES IN EUROPE

A. Remarks by Anthony Liman

European scholars of Japanese studies, and their respective institutions, are isolated one from another--psychologically, politically, and even in terms of physical distance. In Eastern Europe, moreover, Chinese studies heavily predominate over Japanese for obvious political reasons. At the Oriental Institute at Prague, for example, there were over 20 people in the Chinese section and only two in the Japanese section during the early 1960's. Although letters were sent to those universities which have programs in the Japanese field in East Germany, the USSR, Poland and Hungary, only the University of Warsaw responded. In certain of the East European nations, especially Czechoslovakia, aesthetic approaches to Japanese literature are possible, and even encouraged. In the Soviet Union and East Germany, however, the ideological concerns of "social criticism" are dominant. A Japanese "proletarian novel" was translated into Russian as early as 1931, for example. A first-rate language training program exists at Leningrad University, but students are under considerable pressure to work in proletarian literature and are forbidden to touch politically sensitive literature or literature with sexual themes.

Throughout Europe, the classical and philological approaches predominate. Ruhr University, which opened its East Asiatic Institute in 1964, will probably become the best center of Japanese studies in Europe. Like Ruhr University, other German universities stress the philological approach to

Japanese literature. At the University of Paris, however, clarity of meaning in translation and artistic style, as opposed to mot a mot translating, is encouraged along with structural analysis of the given text. In addition to France and Germany, Italy and, of course, Great Britain, have programs in Japanese studies.

The problems facing Japanese studies in Europe, both Eastern and Western, are: (1) insufficient library facilities; (2) a lack of senior research scholarships for study in Japan; and (3) limited specialists and staff, making it impossible for Japanese specialists to teach only their special fields.

B. Discussion

Not only are European Japanologists isolated from each other and under severe limitations financially; they are also isolated from scholars of Japanese literature in the United States. European scholars, especially in the Soviet Union, would greatly appreciate books by American specialists. It might also be possible for the AAS to invite more European scholars to its annual meetings, as it has done in the past at least on one occasion. Given the emphasis in Europe on classical Japanese literature, it might also be useful to have a conference of such scholars and their American counterparts.

The structures of the programs in Europe vary considerably. At Ruhr University, the East Asiatic Institute has two Japanese sections: (1) Japanese history and intellectual history, and (2) Japanese language and literature. Classical Japanese is studied at a very early stage. At the University of Paris the Japanese program is being reorganized into three "cycles": (1) spoken Japanese and area survey courses, (2) advanced Japanese and disciplinary specialization, and (3) seminar work for those able to pursue original research and dedicated to careers in Japanese studies. There appears to be more emphasis on modern Japanese studies at the University of Paris than at German universities in general. The University of Warsaw, Poland's only center of Japanese studies, has a five-year graduate program in Japanese studies staffed by five professors. Like most European universities, the University of Warsaw's Japanese studies program is part of an Oriental institute.

The study of Japanese literature in Latin America began around 1964-65. Those programs in the Japan area that have been established are mainly concerned with language and history. The two centers in Mexico are theoretically graduate programs but in fact are on an undergraduate level. Although very little has been translated from Japanese into Spanish, Japanese literature is very much a part of the literary and art world in Mexico, largely because of the prolific work in literature and art by Kazuya Sakai.

IV. RESEARCH IN PREMODERN JAPANESE LITERATURE

A. Remarks by Donald Keene

Japanese literature has been remarkably well served in terms of translations, but graduate students should not be encouraged to engage in translation projects unless they have genuinely proven themselves competent both in Japanese language comprehension and in English literary skills. Western students of Japanese literature must have a firm knowledge of their own culture and a mastery of their own languages. The Western scholar also brings as a matter of course a Western approach to the study of Japanese literature, but this must be done consciously and artistically. Furthermore, the Western scholar should not be bound by orthodox Japanese views on poetic and literary criticism. Some writers, such as the Zen monk Ikkyū (1394-1481), have been neglected, yet his poetry in Chinese is most appealing. Other literature deals with social conditions, but as translation it is deadly dull--the Yamato Monogatari, for example. We need to write about certain Japanese works, such as the Nō play Matsukaze, not translate them.

Why is a given work good literature? In the study of Nō drama, which is really just beginning in the West, we need to ask what a given play does and how it moves. Such a stance toward the Nō should be applied to all our work on Japanese literature.

The Western scholar cannot, or should not, do the kind of research that Japanese scholars of the bunkengaku tradition carry on. Such research is simply too laborious and our resources and energies too limited.

B. Discussion

Japanese literature has been far too isolated from the general context of literary criticism and literary studies in the world. Although work in the West has been of high quality, Japanese literature has yet to gain a place in world literature. Japanese literary studies should be more strongly represented in the MLA. As it is today, only teachers of Japanese language participate in MLA meetings. Possibly the staff of Literature East and West could establish such a beachhead for Japanese literature. Second, Japanese literature as a field in the humanities must hold its own against the social sciences. At the AAS annual meetings, for example, Japanese literature enjoys singular obscurity.

V. RESEARCH IN MODERN JAPANESE LITERATURE

A. Remarks by Valdo Viglielmo

The annotated translation with critical introduction, however, is still the major component of the research being done in both modern and classical Japanese literature in the United States and the Commonwealth countries. Although this is valuable and is likely to continue, we should consider alternative roads of research, asking ourselves whether our research should conform more closely to that being done in various literatures of the West. At Columbia, for example, translations are no longer acceptable as MA theses in the modern field, and the trend there as well as at Hawaii is toward literary criticism using only excerpted translations of passages in the original works to elucidate particular points being made.

What is the proper balance between translation and literary criticism? The answer, or answers, is inextricably linked to the kind of audience for whom we are writing and doing research. Our audience comprises three groups: colleagues and students of Japanese literature; the English-reading public in the West which has world-wide literary interests; and finally, the English-reading Japanese audience. At any given time we might be writing for any one or combination of these three groups, although it would be a rare article or study that appealed to all three.

As far as the first group is concerned, we still cannot assume that even our most distinguished colleagues in Japanese literary studies have read in the original all the relatively major works in modern Japanese literature. If we cannot reasonably expect that our colleagues have read as broadly in the original as have our counterparts in French or German literature, how much less can we expect an educated American reader to follow a subtle discussion on a topic in Japanese literature if the works discussed are not available in English translation. In writing for the third group, the English-reading Japanese public, the problem is precisely the reverse. We must provide original interpretations by applying standards of criticism derived from our reading in Western literatures to avoid reworking old ground so well trodden by scores of prolific Japanese critics and writers. Moreover, if our criticism of Japanese literature is welcomed by the Japanese it should not be limited merely to the English-reading public. Writing in Japanese for the Japanese public, as splendidly exemplified by Seidensticker's Gendai Nihon Sakkaron, should certainly be developed further. Here, collaboration with Japanese scholars is both inevitable and rewarding.

If, however, Japanese literature is to attain the universality which studies in Russian literature, for example, have already attained, we are still left with the problem of translation, for obviously it is only by translation that the general English-reading public can be introduced to modern Japanese literature. In this respect a comprehensive survey of modern Japanese literature is sorely needed. The surveys pro-

duced to date have concentrated on one area--fiction rather than poetry, for example--or on one period in modern Japanese literature. The surveys in English by Japanese authors, however, do provide much detailed information and enable the Western student and scholar to discover quickly and easily the relative importance attached by the Japanese themselves to their many modern writers. By comparison, Western anthologies, such as Donald Keene's Modern Japanese Literature (1956) and Ivan Morris' Modern Japanese Stories (1962), have been the first serious attempts in the West to assess modern Japanese literature in accordance with norms operative in Western literary criticism. As the authors themselves state quite clearly, the introductions to both volumes are extremely cursory sketches. It might be useful, at least as a stop-gap measure, to translate at least excerpts from Itō Sei's multi-volume Nihon Bundanshi, especially those sections on authors whose works are partially available in translation.

Looking specifically at the gaps in Western research on modern Japanese literature, the period between 1868 and 1885 may better be chronicled by our colleagues in the area of modern Japanese cultural history, or by our collaborating with them to produce a more thorough coverage of these early, turbulent years of widespread social change. The Introduction to Frank Motofuji's translation of and commentary on Mokuami's drama, *Izayoi and Seishin*, is the only treatment of a literary figure of that period in English. The origins of the first truly modern novel in Japan, Futabatei Shimei's Ukigumo (1887-89), have been explored by Marleigh Ryan. The contributions of Tsubouchi Shōyō to the development of modern Japanese literary criticism could be profitably analyzed, although both Ryan and Keene have mentioned him briefly in their studies.

The period between the emergence of Shōyō and Futabatei in the late 1880's and the dominance of the naturalists around the turn of the century has hitherto been only slightly less neglected than the period 1868-1885. Despite Futabatei's innovations in the use of the colloquial, almost all literature of the late 1880's and the 1890's continued to be written in flowery, classical or semi-classical style. Very little has been done on Higuchi Ichiyō, either in criticism or extensive translation. Kōda Rohan and Ozaki Kōyō, two writers considered by Japanese critics to be the most prominent of the 1890's, have also been neglected. The "idea," "pathos," and "domestic" novels, three peculiar types also of the 1890's, will probably not readily find enthusiastic interpreters, though Thomas Swann at Harvard has shown interest in the "idea" novel.

Work on the precursor of the naturalists, Kunikida Doppo, is being done by Jay Rubin and Jean Funatsu; Doppo is particularly suitable for comparative treatment since he explicitly stated his admiration for Wordsworth. The naturalists dominate the period 1905-1912, and work is well underway on their

literary achievements. Apparently, however, the treatment of the naturalists has concentrated primarily on criticism to the neglect of translation. I should hope for more translations of Shimazaki Tōson and other leaders of the Naturalist school, but it is interesting to note once again the tender issue of discerning the balance between criticism and translation involved in our treatment of modern Japanese literature.

In the field of poetry, most of us have paid little heed to Masaoka Shiki, considered by Japanese and Western critics alike to be the major poet of the Meiji period, if not the entire modern era. Although some commentary and translation have been forthcoming, nothing has been done on his criticism and fiction.

Of the two major Meiji and Taishō figures, Mori Ōgai is all but completely neglected while Natsume Sōseki has received considerable attention. A critical biography of Sōseki in English is needed, while nothing short of pioneering work in both translation and criticism is required on Ōgai.

Western scholars are also embarking on studies of the writers of the Shirakaba school. William Sibley is writing about two of them, Shiga Naoya and Arishima Takeo. Although the critical bibliography on Shiga is somewhat meager, it is almost non-existent on Mushakōji Saneatsu, co-founder with Shiga of the Shirakaba movement. Akutagawa Ryūnosuke, whose self-inflicted death in 1927 has been considered an ominous beginning for Shōwa literature, had received the attention of Western scholars even before the many translations of his works in the 1950's and 1960's. Eleven of his best stories were translated into English by Glen Shaw as early as 1930. There has been, however, a dearth of critical material in English on his short stories and his life until very recently. The dissertation of Tsuruta Kin'ya completed in 1967 deals with Akutagawa, and a graduate student at Harvard is also specializing in his works.

The next major movement in Japanese literature was that of proletarian literature in the 1920's and early 1930's. Works produced by left-wing writers which are closest to being artistic successes are those by writers on the periphery of the movement, though the proletarian novel in general is of considerable social and historical importance. The "new perception" (*shin-kankaku*) school also emerged in the 1920's. Of its two leading writers, Kawabata Yasunari has, certainly since last October, enjoyed world-wide renown, while Yokomitsu Riichi, Kawabata's close friend and colleague, has enjoyed very little recognition in the West, despite Kawabata's insistence on Yokomitsu's importance. Some of Yokomitsu's stories have been translated and John Campbell at Harvard intends to produce a dissertation devoted to his life and work.

Nagai Kafū and Tanizaki Junichirō are frequently consid-

ered together because of the similarity of some of their themes, especially nostalgia for a vanishing past. Both have received the attention of translators and literary critics, most notably the yeoman services of Edward Seidensticker. Seidensticker's Kafū the Scribbler, a splendid critical work with extensive translations from a broad spectrum of Kafū's works, should serve as a model to all of us. There are also many other writers who were active in the 1930's and resumed activity in the post-war period. The writer whom almost every Japanese reader would select as the very embodiment of the turbulent years of the immediate post-war period is Dazai Osamu, another in the lengthy list of Japanese literary suicides. Several of Dazai's works have been translated, and James O'Brien at Columbia is writing his dissertation on him. Among the writers who came to prominence only in the post-war period, the flamboyant figure of Mishima Yukio stands stage-center. Although the translations of his works are simply too numerous to list here, no one has yet attempted a full length critical work on him.

B. Discussion

Modern Japanese literature seems particularly popular among MA candidates. At Columbia there are ten MA essays in progress, or just completed, on modern literary figures. Meiji literature, euphemistically called "transitional," is painfully difficult, and modern writers are simply easier to deal with. Although it is the tendency of university programs in modern Japanese literature no longer to accept translations as MA and PhD theses, we should be concerned with problems of translation. Concern with "true meaning" and with translation generally as a problem in world literature increases our perception of great literature on a basis other than saleability.

Are we now at the stage in Japanese literary studies where "scholars" and "translators" should be distinguished? Although the line between "translating scholars" and "scholarly translators" is a thin one, more recognition and support of the special literary skills of translation would free the scholar to pursue literary research rather than, as at present, translation. But translators have in many cases simply stopped working for publishers because of the impossibly low remuneration. Unlike most other languages, Japanese consumes an immense amount of time in the translating. Royalties should, therefore, go more to the translator than to the Japanese author, even to the amount of 90 per cent. Second, university positions might be made available to translators who would teach courses in "creative translating," in much the same way as writers teach courses in creative writing. At any rate, translation must be continued and more equitably supported. The Ford Foundation will no longer support the National Translation Center in Austin, and the universities will have to absorb the burden. It is therefore even more important that the universities create special posts for transla-

tors, possibly like those not available to science researchers.

VI. COMPARATIVE LITERATURE AND TRANSLATION

A. Remarks by William F. Sibley

Two of the basic aims of comparative literature are to transcend national boundaries and to overcome entrenched scholarly prejudices. Despite pleas to refrain from speaking of the various schools in the field of comparative literature, the outsider cannot help but be struck by the plethora of divergent methodologies and radically different priorities that already exist within this relatively new discipline. Some begin with linguistics, of one variety or another; others with theories of genres and archetypal patterns; still others take a rather ethnocentric view, seeing national literatures as unique. Formalism, structuralism, historicism, neo-classicism; phonemics, morphemics, semantics; stylistics and thematics; archetypal, motivic and mythical analysis; Marxist-Leninist dialectics and Freudian or neo-Freudian psychoanalysis; and more recently, Levi-Straussian anthropological and Chomskian linguistic approaches--these are but a "few" categories for the weaponry stored in the comparatists' arsenal.

Given the specialist world we live in, most men and women engaged in the literary enterprise feel obliged to maintain a vigilant watch against incursions into their chosen fields by non-literary disciplines, at the same time borrowing liberally, sometimes indiscriminately, from history, philosophy, linguistics, sociology, psychology, and even the natural sciences. No one would deny that over the past thirty or forty years the study of literature has been purified by this vigilance and enriched by some of these borrowings, nor that it has become appallingly complex in the process. As Northrup Frye has noted, literary criticism cannot be "a simple or one-level activity"; the student of literature "must admit the principle of polysemous meaning" or select one of the many schools or groups in literary criticism "and then try to prove that all others are less legitimate. The former is the way of scholarship,...the latter is the way of pedantry...."

If the student of Japanese literature admits the principle of "polysemous," or manifold meaning, what then? The comprehensive historical theories were initially devised without any reference to Far Eastern literature and it is an unwarranted assumption that they are applicable. Folklore and myth motifs, as well as image, metaphor and symbol structures, are also derived from an axiomatic Western tradition. Facile analogy--treating Genji's yearnings after a succession of mother figures as Oedipal, for example--plays us false. Yet it would be wrong to argue that principles and practices developed by comparatists, of both new and old schools, cannot

be fruitfully incorporated into our work. These methods have in fact dealt a welcome coup-de-grace to the study of Japanese literature as the step-child of "Japanology." Furthermore, Japanese literary critics have themselves begun to employ perspectives and priorities similar to those of Western comparatists--and with provocative reinterpretations.

We might, however, congratulate ourselves that we have been spared the sterile debate, the methodological fulminations, of the comparatists that have accompanied the emergence of comparative literature and the various schools of modern criticism. We have benefited both by the vast Japanese corpus of literary studies and by the mistakes of our comparatist seniors. Most of us are comparatists in the basic sense: we cannot help comparing the language, imagery, larger elements of style and structure, and whole genres which we encounter in an inevitably foreign literature to those in our own.

B. Discussion

All institutions questioned in the survey on Japanese literature offer at least one semester course on Japanese literature in translation. A checklist of translations in progress, periodically kept up-to-date, would be useful to all of us. Roy Teele, editor of Literature East and West, volunteered to look into such a project. Also needed are translations of Japanese criticism on a selective basis.

It was recognized by all conference participants that experts were greatly needed in Kambun. In Japan, Kambun is the province of the historian, though many source materials useful to the literary researcher are written in Kambun; consequently, Japanese literary scholars themselves have serious problems in regard to Kambun. It was suggested that a summer seminar on Kambun be organized for professors in Japanese literature to at least begin to overcome the gap.

Comparative literature is inevitably involved since we teach Japanese literature in English translation, making it in fact a form of English literature. Neither a "fact-finding" approach nor a "one-to-one" type of comparison is desirable; we should make more conscious efforts to compare themes and forms. A consciously comparative approach is also helpful in enticing and keeping Western students in the field of Japanese literature.

VII. PROBLEMS IN TEACHING AND GRADUATE TRAINING

A. Remarks by Edwin Cranston

Of the eighteen institutions which responded to the questionnaire on training in Japanese literature, nine either have

or will have by 1969-70 both MA and PhD programs in Japanese literature. Adding those that probably have such programs but did not respond, there are approximately eleven universities in the United States with PhD programs in Japanese literature. According to the various regulations governing such programs, the minimum time for achieving the MA is one to two years, for the PhD (AB to start of dissertation), three years. Columbia imposes a seven year upper limit from start of graduate study to completion of all degree requirements for the PhD. Six universities responded that at least one year of Chinese language study was required for PhD aspirants.

The content, emphases and approaches of the program in Japanese literature varied widely from university to university. None of the literary periods, however, is completely neglected, though the pre-Heian period is the least commonly taught, and the modern (post 1868) period the most. Those taught in depth, of course, varied with the interests and training of the faculty. In general, courses on modern Japanese literature stressed rapid reading, while those on classical literature concentrated on close textual examination and attendant historical and philological problems. All universities questioned offered survey courses on Japanese literature in translation. At Columbia, Donald Keene has supplemented the staple literature with selections in Japanese of the larger translated works for those with some familiarity with Japanese; this is a novel idea that might be employed in other universities as well.

Most universities responded, if they responded at all, on the question of "literal vs. liberal" translation in terms of a mean between the two: "liberal, yet rigorous"; "close but artistic"; "accuracy in the content and idiomatic level of the original"; and "liberal, once the decoding stage is over."

The most interesting replies were to the questions: "What do you see as the main problems at the present time in training students in Japanese literature? What changes should be made or what should be done that is not now being done?" One of the basic problems was that of reconciling linguistic with more purely intellectual training, how to reach competence in the language and still leave time for students to "exercise their gray matter." Despite all the problems involved, great progress has been made over the last twenty years in producing linguistically and methodologically competent scholars. Opportunities for study in Japan, such as that provided by the Inter-University Center for Japanese Language Studies in Tokyo, were behind much of this forward surge and were obviously connected with the availability of funds for overseas study and research. "The continuing effort to improve language teaching and learning is vital to the study of Japanese literature in this country." Yet language training and literary scholarship are obviously not synonymous and may even conflict with each other. The earlier a student embarks on the

language--one hopes at the high school level someday--the sooner he is able to get into literary scholarship.

Another problem is that of crowded elementary classes followed by high dropout rates toward the end of the second year. The lack of financial support for undergraduate study in Japan is another problem in the field generally; the absence of such funds inhibits recruitment of good students into the Japanese field at the critical juncture in their educations. Outlets for the publication of good student translations at the graduate level would be a psychological boost as well as an incentive to higher quality work. There is also an increasing predominance of women enrolled in the humanities field in general, and although there are notable exceptions, many stop short of their academic goals. Finally, better arrangements should be made for graduate research in Japan to prevent exploitation of Japanese scholars by fledgling Western scholars.

B. Discussion

In both course structure and faculty personnel there is a great divide between language and literature. The question involves what to teach in the language classes, since language training serves all the disciplines involved in the Japan field. For those specializing in literature, a thorough knowledge of premodern Japanese and Japanese literature is essential, even though many students intend to specialize in modern Japanese literature.

One way of recruiting students into the language itself is the survey course on Japanese literature. Here, the comparative approach, as pointed out earlier, can stimulate students into at least an initial plunge into the Japanese language and then into Japanese literature by bringing into focus the contrasts with English and American literatures. In this respect it might be useful to have introductory courses in world literatures, rather than purely area courses on Japanese history, geography, etc. Some balance between area and disciplinary requirements should be struck. Why, for example, should a student of Japanese literature take a survey course in Chinese history, rather than in 18th-century French literature?

VIII. RECOMMENDATIONS

The problems confronting the American scholar of Japanese literature are also immense, first in the technical sense of library resources, bibliography and communication; and second in the human relations sense of returning to our Japanese benefactors adequate recompense for their indispensable assistance and guidance. Gaining access to Japanese libraries, institutions, and persons; tracking down a book in a Japanese library; reproduction of materials; and keeping informed of

work in obscure journals that often proves highly valuable--all are technical, and terribly time-consuming, problems facing the Western scholar. Once a Japanese scholar has given us his invaluable assistance on these and other problems, we are then faced with the difficulty of adequately reciprocating his generosity. Most Japanese scholars simply will not accept monetary repayment from individuals. Can we compensate by arranging exchange programs? Although this has been and is being done, the person to whom we are indebted is likely to be a scholar of Japanese literature: what can he gain by residence in the United States? One benefit is time itself, time for the pressed and pressured Japanese scholar to read and do original research. Such exchanges are very difficult to arrange with universities, however.

A center is needed in Japan, therefore, that would serve the needs of Western scholars of Japanese literature, a center which would (1) track down references in response to requests from Western scholars, (2) answer correspondence, (3) maintain contact with Japanese professors, (4) reproduce materials on request, and (5) perform other services on request. One person on a salaried basis would be adequate for manning the center. The costs of books, reproductions and other services would be borne by the person requesting them. The ideal person to head the center, which would be almost entirely a one-man operation, would be a Japanese scholar of Japanese literature who had retired from active university teaching. His knowledge of the field and his access to Japanese scholars would be invaluable to the functioning of the center. We therefore unanimously resolve:

That an office be established in Japan to respond to requests for bibliographical and other information and to provide services on request to Western scholars in the field of Japanese literature. Such services would be reimbursed by the persons requesting them.

Since the center would be largely self-supporting, funds are needed primarily for the initial creation of the facility and its equipment.

It was also noted that the Nihon Gakujutsu Kaigi under Hisamatsu Senichi is attempting to establish a Kokubungaku Shiryō Sentā, which could be very useful to Western scholars. The proposed Sentā will also attempt to compile information on Japanese graduate students in the field of literature. Another useful institution, founded several years ago, is the Kindai Bungakkan at Komaba, which has an excellent library on modern Japanese literature, provides Xerox facilities for scholars, and conducts seminars and special projects.

7f: ANNEX A

Participants

James Araki, University of Hawaii
 Karen Brazell, Princeton University
 Robert H. Brower, University of Michigan
 Edwin A. Cranston, Harvard University
 Yoshio Iwamoto, University of Illinois
 Barry S. Jackman, Carleton College
 Donald Keene, Columbia University
 Jinichi Konishi, Tokyo University of Education
 Anthony V. Liman, University of Toronto
 Edwin McClellan, University of Chicago
 James R. Morita, University of Chicago
 Robert E. Morrell, Washington University
 Ivan Morris, Columbia University
 Francis Motofuji, University of California, Berkeley
 Jay Rubin, University of Chicago
 Barbara Ruch, University of Pennsylvania
 Marleigh Ryan, Columbia University
 Kazuya Sakai, El Colegio de Mexico
 Carl Sesar, Wesleyan University
 Hajime Shinoda, Tokyo Municipal University
 Donald H. Shively, Harvard University
 William F. Sibley, University of Rochester
 Richard L. Spear, University of Kansas
 Roy E. Teele, Southwestern University
 David A. Titus, Wesleyan University, Social Science Research
 Council
 Makoto Ueda, University of Toronto
 Valdo Viglielmo, University of Hawaii
 Dana Young, Stanford University
 Leon Zolbrod, University of British Columbia

7f: ANNEX B

Priority Topics in Japanese Literary Studies

Suggested Translations (asterisk indicates work was mentioned
 in several replies)

I. Pre-Modern

A. Poetry

*Portions or all of Kokinshū, Shinkokinshū
Ryōjinhisho, Kaifusō
 Portions of Roppyakuban utaawase
 Selected verses and sequences by individual poets,
 e.g., Izumi Shikibu, Teika, Saigyō

Renga of Sōgi

Haikai

Haiku: Bashō and Buson

Poetics: karon, hairon; Shinkei's Sasamegato

B. Prose

Nihon ryōiki

Utsubo m.

Yamato m.

Post-Genji monogatari: Sagoromo m., *Hamamatsu chūnagon m., Tsutsumi chūnagon m., *Torikaebaya m., Yowa no nezame

*Heike m. (new translation)

Selections from setsuwa anthologies: Konjaku m.
Shasekishū (Ūji shui forthcoming?)

Mumyō zōshi

*Diaries from Kamakura and later, both in Japanese and kambun, e.g., Teika's Meigetsu'ki, Kaidōki (Towazugatari forthcoming?)

*Selections from gozan bungaku

A few kana zōshi

Saikaku: Okimiyage, Oritome

Ueda Akinari: *Ugetsu m. (forthcoming?)

Shikitei Samba: Ukiyoburo, Ukiyodoko (selections)

Bakin's yomihon (selections)

C. Drama

*Seami's treatises: all

Kabuki plays: Kanadehon chūshingura, Sugawara denju tenari kagami, Meiboku sendai hagi; one of Tsuruya Namboku's plays

D. History and Criticism

*Motoori Norinaga's oeuvre

II. Modern

A. Prose

One of Ozaki Kōyō's more popular novels

*More of Sōseki

Stories by Ōgai (forthcoming?)

One or more of Izumi Kyōka's novels

Toson's *Hakai; Yoakemae

Something by Hakucho

Shiga Naoya's An'ya Kōro

A full-length novel by Yokomitsu Riichi

Essays and/or a novel by Nakano Shigeharu

B. History and Criticism

There were few suggestions, except that a translation or adaptation of one of the "standard" survey histories would be of some use; and a couple of replies mentioned that translated selections from the works of a number of individual critics might be worth having, e.g., Tsudo Sōkichi, Kobayashi Hideo, Kamei Katsu'ichiro, Nakamura Mitsuo and Eto Jun.

Most Desired Ph.D. Topics (number in parenthesis after a subject indicates number of times listed by respondents)

General

Computer analyses of literary works

Pre-Modern: Poetry

Influence of Chinese poetry on individual Japanese poets
 Specific influences of Chinese poetry on Manyō chōka
 Japanese court poetry and Buddhism: a study of internally non-associative allusion
 Development of utaawase
 Literary biography of Saigyō
 Literary biography of Shunzei (under study, University of Michigan)
 Chinese poetry and the ideals and practice of Fujiwara Teika
 Literary biography of Kamo no Chōmei
 History of the compilation of Shinkokinshū
 Literary biography of Kyōgoku Tamekane
 Literary biography of Imagawa Ryōshun
 Literary biography of Shōtetsu
 Literary biography of Sōgi (3)
 Renga (5)
 Waka conventions and renga techniques (2)
Ryōjīn hishō: introduction and selected translations
Waka in Edo period
 Kagawa Kageki as poet and critic
 Study of haikai revival of Temmei era
 Relationship of Buson's painting and haikai
Haibun of Buson

Pre-Modern: Fiction

Realism and the novel form in Heian and Genroku
 Rise of monogatari and the reading public
 Study and translation of Utsubo monogatari (under study, Harvard)
 Structure of Genji monogatari (3)
 Prose style of Genji
 Love and guilt in Genji
 Characterization in Genji

Kagerō nikki as the first "I-novel"

Study and translation of late Heian and Kamakura
monogatari (2)

Heike monogatari (2)

Gempei seisuiki

Setsuwa collections and themes (2)

Medieval Buddhist literature

Study and translation of various types of otogizōshi (2)

Sex and money in Saikaku: their relationship

Influence of Chinese fiction on Edo fiction (2)

Influence of kokugaku on late 18th-early 19th century nar-
rative prose

Literary biography of Ueda Akinari

Ugetsu monogatari

Literary biography of Santō Kyōden

Pre-Modern: Drama

Structure and poetry of yōkyoku

Nō theory

Chinese influences and Zeami

Zenchiku and his ideas on the nō (2)

Historical survey of early jōruri

Plays of Takeda Izumo and collaborators

Pre-Modern: Other

Mumyō sōshi and early monogatari criticism (under study,
University of Michigan: "Pre-modern criticism of the
Tale of Genji")

Gozan bungaku (2)

Kana hōgo

Keichū and the National Learning movement

Oritaku shiba no ki

Tandai shōshinroku

Modern: Poetry

Modern poetry

Poetry of Shimazaki Tōson

Satō Haruo

Modern: Fiction

Characteristics of the Japanese novel

Fictional mode of literary naturalism

Higuchi Ichiyō

Mori Ōgai (2)

Nihon Rōmanha

Shirakabaha and the Taishō period

Izumi Kyōka

Ibuse Masuji and humor in modern Japanese literature (2)

Arishima Takeo

Yokomitsu Riichi

Murō Saisei

Dazai Osamu and the watakushi shōsetsu
Kawabata Yasunari

Modern: Other

History of modern Japanese literary criticism
Role of literary journals in history of modern literature
Impact of translations from Western literature
Development of modern literary style
Tsubouchi Shōyō
Shōsetsu shinzui

APPENDIX 7g

Conference on the Status of Studies in
Modern Japanese Art

April 25-26, 1969, Boston

I. INTRODUCTION

The subcommittee on art met at the Fogg Museum, Harvard University, under the chairmanship of John Rosenfield, together with Alexander Soper, Jan Fontein, Glen Webb (absent in Japan), and Miyeko Murase. Held on April 25 and 26, the conference was attended by 41 scholars from both academic and museum spheres as well as from the closely related fields of literature, music, and Japanese cultural history. One member of the Joint Committee staff also attended (see Annex A).

II. BUDDHIST ART AND YAMATO-E

A. Buddhist Art--Remarks by Alexander Soper

Back in 1935, when American specialists in Japanese art history could be numbered on the fingers of one hand, very little of Japanese art was accessible to foreign scholars. At that time geography and the difficulties of language-training were severe limitations; outside of Japan minimal library and museum resources inhibited serious study of Japanese art. Since the end of the Pacific War, however, such elaborate publications and elegant reproductions have appeared in Japan that now the problem is one of keeping up with Japanese scholarship. Quite obviously a high degree of competence in the Japanese language is necessary, if not for the MA, then certainly for the Ph.D. Progress in the history of Japanese art can be made only by students able to incorporate the prolific work of Japanese scholars.

It is probably not possible, at any rate, for historians of Japanese art to approach the level achieved by historians of Western art in terms of conceptualization and understanding. Can Western theories, such as Wölfflin's on the evolution of style, be applied to Japanese art? Even if this were linked to the study of Chinese art--comparative study of temple architecture, for example--it would still be difficult, and possibly dangerous, to apply labels of "archaic," "baroque," etc., to the large periods of Sino-Japanese culture. Within the East Asian tradition, moreover, there is the problem of determining how and when Japanese styles vary from the continental prototypes. In the history of Japanese architecture, for example, it is simply not true that the ancient cap-

ital of Nara was a copy of Chāng-an; the Japanese at the time were not sufficiently aware of Chinese architecture for such massive effort in duplication. The Japanese at certain junctures in the evolution of their arts also decided to keep intact what they had imported and not to adopt Chinese-style modifications as they occurred on the continent. Does this mean, however, that there is an independent "Japanese spirit" in Japan's art? If so, the "Japanization" of art became an amorphous process, difficult to define today.

B. Discussion

If Western theories of style development cannot be applied to the evolution of Japanese art, is it nonetheless possible to ascertain an intelligible pattern of stylistic variations over a vast period of time--from Nara to Kamakura, for example? Can a theory of form be developed to date objects over such a long span? From 800 to 1100, for example, there are severe problems in dating works of Buddhist art. In addition, we have recently become aware of the rich abundance of provincial art as the result of studies by Kurata, McCallum, and Kunō. Consequently it becomes increasingly difficult to find significant continuities in Japanese art, to find a line of orderly development of form in time.

We might be advised, however, to distinguish between the inspired or creative art of the metropolitan Buddhist ateliers of Nara, Kyoto, and even Kamakura, as opposed to provincial copies. Discounting the provincial, therefore, a central style might be defined, especially in Buddhist sculpture, corresponding to the formal adoption of Chinese types, modified by Japanese materials and taste and the aesthetic needs of the different Buddhist sects.

A manageable overview of Japanese Buddhist art is still essential and might be accomplished on a comparative basis. The relationships among Chinese, Korean, Japanese, and possibly even Indian art, on a factual, case-by-case basis, must be determined first, concentrating especially on dated objects, and then parallel chronologies might prove possible. The long series of articles in Museum by Mizuno Keizaburō and Satō Akio, treating dated Heian period sculpture, and the new publication Nihon Chōkoku-shi Kiso Shiryō Shūsei, will be especially valuable. The comparative approach now being practiced in the U.S. by Marilyn Rhie and in Japan to a lesser extent by Matsubara Saburō will be useful in dating art objects which lack documentation and also in revealing uniquely Japanese features of Japanese art. Since musicologists and other historians in cultural spheres rely heavily on art historians for outlines of the general periods in cultural history, problems of dating and definition of periods are of considerable importance to them as well.

Note should be taken of the extraordinary rise in the

range and quality of original works of Japanese art in Western collections. An enlightened policy of the Japanese Commission for the Protection of Cultural Properties of allowing works of high quality and significance to be exported will be rewarded by enhanced appreciation of Japan and its culture abroad. However, the community of foreign scholars should recognize more fully its responsibility to study and publish this material thoroughly so that it be known by our Japanese colleagues.

C. Yamato-e--Remarks by Jan Fontein

The study of Japanese art may contribute to our knowledge and awareness of European art. For such a contribution to be made, however, much more work is required on Japanese art in the West, with careful selection of Ph.D. monographs to overcome the handicaps.

Fortunately there are fine narrative scrolls (e-makimono), perhaps the oldest definable aspect of Yamato-e, in the United States which are valid subjects for doctoral dissertations. Although in Western languages there are major studies of e-maki by Miyeko Murase and Gisela Armbruster, much more can be done, given the availability of material outside Japan. One handicap, however, is the fact that many scrolls, such as the Kōnin Shōnin E-den, are fragmented and scattered in obscure places. Since many scrolls are narrative in nature, moreover, they are suitable subjects for joint research by art historians and specialists in Japanese literature and customs. Finally, some scrolls, such as the Kegon Engi Emaki, reveal Japanese attitudes toward China and are useful in the analyzing of the "Japaneseness" of Japanese art.

D. Discussion

Serious studies of later stages of Yamato-e, especially of the Kōetsu-Sōtatsu-Kōrin school or the Tosa school and its ramifications, are needed in the West. Note should be taken of Milan Mihal's work on Sakai Hōitsu, and David Waterhouse's study of the Seattle Deer Scroll, which deserves to be fully published.

Is it really relevant to discuss Yamato-e and other Japanese art forms in terms of "uniqueness" to Japan? Whether the word "uniqueness" is appropriate or not, some means must be discovered to make Japanese art understood on its own aesthetic merits. There has been a tendency for art historians to focus on the "masterpieces" of Japanese art which reveal Chinese influence at the expense of works of periods when there was no such influence. The stylistic and intellectual problems of the former seem more complex and intriguing; the latter, however, often bring us to levels of pure, sensory experience which are less academic in nature.

The study of narrative scrolls is important to the under-

standing of popular art in Japan. There are only a few examples of narrative scrolls from China, but the rare T'ang fragments that are available make it possible to analyze the origins of this art form and its relation to Buddhist emakimono. Yamato-e became a popular art form in the Kamakura period and continued to be widely popular throughout the early Tokugawa period. The Otogizoshi, for example, catered directly to popular taste. Among several problems which arise in the study of scrolls, there is the difficulty involved in reading the calligraphic texts which accompany the paintings and in analyzing thus their literary content. Collaboration between Japanese and American scholars is needed to unite the fragments of certain scrolls which have been scattered widely. There is difficulty accounting for the different stylistic traditions within narrative scroll painting. Few of the artists are known to us in any more detail than their names or cryptic references in old Japanese historical sources. It is difficult to account fully for the great flowering of the Yamato-e traditions during the Momoyama and early Edo periods.

III. SUIBOKU-GA, BUNJIN-GA, AND RELATED STYLES

A. Suiboku-ga--Remarks by Harrie Vanderstappen

During the fourteenth, fifteenth, and sixteenth centuries the repetition of themes and motifs makes dating as well as identification of the core artists in suiboku-ga especially difficult. Many screens which appear in the backgrounds of other paintings also have suiboku motifs. Thus, suiboku as it evolved in Zen monasteries leads directly to the secular Kanō school. One major problem in the study of suiboku painting (and of Japanese painting generally) is the lack of in-depth biographies of leading artists. The most detailed biography is Hajime Watanabe's study of Shūbun. Possibly there is enough material now available for a monograph on the early fifteenth century artist Minchō (Chō Densu). A further problem exists in determining the authenticity of suiboku paintings, since there were many copies, signed and unsigned, as well as forgeries during the Edo period.

B. Discussion

Is it possible to take up the question of the aesthetic merits of Japanese art, as distinguished from questions of authenticity, dating, and biography? How is a "great" Japanese painter to be recognized? For example, there appears to be some bias against paintings by monks (Indara or Yin T'o-lo, for example). Are works of such men to be judged for evidence of technical proficiency, or for their "spiritual resonance?" How are good paintings within a given category or genre to be distinguished, as opposed to the problem of judging the merits of one genre in contrast with another? To treat these mat-

ters, initially it is good to start where possible with the evaluation of a given artist by his contemporaries, and then add to this our own understanding of the wider context of time and place. Negatively, we also need to discover why a given artist was not valued by his contemporaries. For example, several artists "broke the rules" by their rough brush work; did such rule-breaking mean lack of worth, or was this their mode of innovation?

Styles in Japanese art have also been blended many times over. The style of Chinese wenjen-hua blended with monk traditions, and Zen painters fused Chinese (intellectual) and Japanese (religious) points of view. How is the impact of a single artistic personality, a Sesshū for example, to be judged? Considerable work on the system of patronage under the Ashikaga shoguns, which appears to have highlighted individual artists and schools, is required. Were the artists who were patronized by the bakufu, the goyōeshi, Zen monks of low status or not?

For a proper understanding of Muromachi art, the late Kamukura period must also be understood. The tradition of the Court art academy continued from the Nara period into the Muromachi, but in the latter, rival academies grew to maturity in response to the taste of the bushi. For example, the Takuma school, although continuing Buddhist styles, developed a powerful brush stroke manner that went against the calm of Fujiwara Buddhist art. In the new schools which rivaled the Court edokoro, there were two trends: (1) continuations of Buddhist art and (2) completely new art forms, such as those influenced by Zen. Later there was a trend toward synthesis; Zen monks painted birds, orchids, and other "non-Zen" subjects. Minchō, for example, did both traditional Buddhist and landscape paintings. Shūbun was both a monk and Shōkokujī and active in Buddhist painting and sculpture. Was he, and many others like him, an ebushi (in the sense of a professional artist living essentially a layman's life), or were they genuine monks? After Shūbun, the situation changed; the artists used their seals and identified themselves more prominently. Before Sesshū, however, the artists were very often anonymous, desiring no individual recognition for their work.

C. Bunjin-ga--Remarks by James Cahill and Calvin French

The fact that there is but one study of Bunjin-ga in English is a tribute to the influence exerted by Ernest Fenollosa's contempt for that genre. Only recently have Japanese art historians begun to study the life and work of Ike no Taiga intensively; Taiga would thus be an excellent choice for a dissertation subject. To begin with, we lack even a guide to Bunjin-ga. Here the problem of what is a "masterpiece" is very difficult, given the lack of attention paid to the school. Secondly, works in this mode simply do not "look like" masterpieces; Bunjin-ga is in a more modern idiom and

playful. For example, Buson, who was primarily a poet, painted frequently to illustrate his poems--and both poems and paintings were lightly humorous. To evaluate Bunjin-ga, therefore, our criteria must be redefined. And for a meaningful evaluation we must be in tune with that mode and not prejudge.

There has been little work on the first generation artists of Bunjin-ga, Gion Nankai or Yanagisawa Kien, for example. But the study of this entire mode offers real possibilities for combined scholarship in art and literature. Since Bunjin-ga developed as a reaction to the Kanō school, the social atmosphere that stimulated the rise of Bunjin-ga also requires attention. Again, Bunjin-ga needs to be valued in terms of itself, not in a comparative context of Chinese-Japanese, although obviously the student must have a firm grasp on the history of later Chinese paintings. The entire field is open to pioneering work.

IV. UKIYO-E--REMARKS BY DAVID WATERHOUSE

Unlike other Japanese art, Ukiyo-e can be studied in detail in the West because of the many collections, public and private, or wood block prints, books and paintings in North America. Ukiyo-e is both popular and literary. But the bias of art historians against popular art is revealed by the fact that only two dissertations on Ukiyo-e (by Harold P. Stern and Ludwig Backhofer) have been noted at Ann Arbor, despite the availability of materials. Four things are required to improve this situation: (1) knowledge of collections, (2) monographs on Ukiyo-e artists, (3) a critical, not sentimental approach, and (4) serious concern, not flippant dismissal.

Apparently, the quality of this genre declined drastically from around 1800-1830, and this in itself is an important topic for the historian of art and taste. A glance at Utamarō's prints reveals the plunge in quality that occurred when popularity, as measured by volume of sales, became a prime consideration with the publishers. On the other hand, surimono continued at a high level of taste and quality, even though other aspects of Ukiyo-e declined.

V. RECENT AND CONTEMPORARY JAPANESE ART-- REMARKS BY ELLEN CONANT

There are no systematic works on modern Japanese art by Westerners, and in the United States there is little taught about Meiji and later art. Part of the problem is related to conscious efforts during the Meiji period to preserve the "Japanese tradition" from being over-run by Nanga and Yōga

styles. At the time there were two trends among Japanese art historians: (1) the study of Japanese art, encouraged by Fenollosa and Okakura Tenshin, and (2) the study of Western art. This controversy has been largely detrimental to the study of modern Japanese art and was waged not so much among artists as among those who wished to control educational policy in the schools.

Although the Meiji centennial has made Meiji art visible, there is as yet no detailed biography of a modern Japanese artist in Western languages. Only sixteen works by modern Japanese artists are now listed as national treasures. In short, the field of modern Japanese art, like that of Bunjinga, is ready for pioneering efforts.

7g: ANNEX A

List of Participants

Emily Biederman, Museum of Fine Arts
 Theodore Bowie, University of Indiana
 Susan Bush, University of Massachusetts
 James Cahill, University of California
 Cornelius P. Chang, Columbia University
 Ann Clapp, Wellesley College
 Ellen Conant, Harvard University
 Usher P. Coolidge, Fogg Art Museum
 Fumiko Cranston, Fogg Art Museum
 Richard Edwards, University of Michigan
 Jan Fontein, Museum of Fine Arts
 Calvin French, University of Michigan
 Money Hickman, Museum of Fine Arts
 Wai-kam Ho, Cleveland Museum of Art
 Chimyo Horioka, Museum of Fine Arts
 Yasuhiro Iguchi, Museum of Fine Arts
 Donald Keene, Columbia University
 Bunsaku Kurata, Ministry of Education, Japan
 George Kuwayama, Los Angeles County Museum of Art
 Sherman Lee, Cleveland Museum of Art
 Max Loehr, Fogg Art Museum
 Robert Maeda, Brandeis University
 William Malm, University of Michigan
 Fred Martinson, McClung Museum, University of Tennessee
 Donald McCallum, Vassar College
 Milan Mihal, University of Vanderbilt
 Robert Moes, University of Hawaii
 Hugo Munsterberg, State University of New York, New Palz
 Mieko Murase, Columbia University
 Marlyn Rhie, University of Chicago
 Millard Rogers, University of Washington
 John Rosenfield, Fogg Art Museum
 Benjamin Rowland, Fogg Art Museum

Penelope Scull, New York University
Shujiro Shimada, Princeton University
Donald Shively, Harvard University
Alexander Soper, New York University
Ichimatsu Tanaka, Ministry of Education
David A. Titus, Wesleyan University
Henry Tsubner, Seattle Art Museum
Harrie Vanderstappen, University of Chicago
David Waterhouse, University of Toronto

APPENDIX 7h

Conference on the Status of Studies in
Japanese Language and Linguistics

May 8-9, 1969, SSRC, New York

I. INTRODUCTION

The conference on Japanese language and linguistics, chaired by Roy Miller of Yale, was held at the offices of the Social Science Research Council on May 8-9, 1969. It was attended by fifteen scholars and specialists in Japanese language teaching and linguistics and three staff members (see Annex A).

II. THE RELATION BETWEEN LANGUAGE TEACHING
AND LINGUISTICS RESEARCH

The principal findings of the meeting are a number of tentative conclusions on various ways in which the teaching of Japanese on the one hand, the higher-level research on Japanese language and linguistics on the other, can better be coordinated into the activities and overall requirements of various higher degree programs in American universities.

It became clear early in the meetings that any future and/or more specialized conferences would most profitably separate scholars with primary responsibility for the programming and direction of language programs from those other scholars interested primarily in language and linguistic research. The difficulty with such a division lies in the fact that the programming and direction of language programs are not only meaningless but impossible without prior higher-level research in language and linguistics. Without the discovery and organization of data, which is what is meant by research in language and linguistics, it is impossible to present the data in the form necessary for effective language instruction programs. Meetings like those just concluded, in which both language teachers and linguistic scholars meet together for common discussions, still have their place, but there will also be a continuing need in the future for separate meetings (the membership of which, however, may still probably have to have considerable overlapping).

The relation of language teaching and linguistic research to the various academic discipline interests and needs occupied much of the discussion, and this certainly is one of the areas in which much future work remains to be done. In this connection the experience of the Foreign Service Institute seemed especially important and relevant and also likely to be

overlooked by the "academic community." Their experience with predicting, programming, and evaluating the actual investment in classroom and laboratory contact hours for various degrees of language proficiency in connection with their current Vietnamese program, seemed to be of particular significance for the problems of Japanese language teaching, particularly in graduate programs. Future meetings between members of this group with others primarily representing disciplinary interests should aim at implementing similar evaluations and predictions of the investment necessary for training graduate students with satisfactory language skills.

III. LANGUAGE TEACHING

It was brought out from several different angles that the present audiolingual techniques, which underlie most of the work in the most advanced university language programs today, are in a certain sense only partial implementations of what were always essentially full-time intensive programs, mostly developed out of the experience of World War II. In shifting these techniques over to the needs of the academic curriculum, the problem is whether or not as much of their effectiveness has not been lost as has been gained in the process. More sophisticated planning and evaluation is very much needed to be carried out by language and linguistics scholars, working together with discipline people, in order to come up with a rational estimate of the number of hours actually necessary for reasonable hope of success in achieving various language skills and goals. With these estimates in hand it will then be both possible as well as necessary to restudy the requirements of time on our students, particularly graduate students, and reconsider the possibility of instituting at least one nationwide full-time language program from which people could go both to Japan and on to advanced work in graduate studies in this country, leaving most of their time and energy free from language tasks. The consensus appeared to be that while the work available at the present Stanford Center in Tokyo has certainly much to recommend it, its almost total isolation from ongoing American academic programs and its lack of trained language teaching leadership continues to inhibit its utility to the academic community.

IV. LINGUISTICS RESEARCH

Apart from problems of pedagogy, the areas of Japanese language and linguistic research present a vast number of tasks for the future. These are summarized in the working papers of Martin and Miller presented at the meetings (see Annex B and Annex C). It is in these areas of diachronic description and synchronic historical study of Japanese that the

greatest possibilities for binational participation exist. This is especially true of the preparation of teaching materials, which must in the future grow out of (and be a secondary step over and above) the basic data-oriented research which these two position papers call for. The principal defects of present teaching materials and the present difficulty experienced in preparing future materials, especially for teaching various earlier stages of the language, lies in the fact that we lack adequate descriptive and historical studies out of which these materials might be assembled.

The meetings stressed over and over again the fact that one of the chief limiting factors to date has been our tendency to attempt to use with our students materials prepared in Japan by Japanese scholars for Japanese, just as they are. This is especially true of lexical sources but extends throughout the field in general. The needs of American students being very different and the requirements and standards of American linguistic scholarship being quite distinct from those still obtaining in Japan, the entire area presents attractive possibilities for future binational cooperation.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Among the specific needs which the meetings discovered, the following merit special attention:

1. Most elementary and second-level language teaching is done in this country by Japanese who are, however, more or less disoriented both from Japanese academic circles and from American academic circles. To this problem is added that of their isolation from each other, there generally being few such persons on any one campus among whom ideas, techniques, etc., might be shared. An entirely working-level meeting at which they might share with each other their problems and techniques would certainly do much both to improve their orientation toward their work and to advance their profession as language teachers.

It was felt that the Association of Teachers of Japanese might in this, as in many other respects, be a practical channel through which such problems might be approached.

2. Problems and possibilities of teaching Japanese to students of Chinese, as well as the other way around, are probably best approached in the context of a total "Sino-xenic" concept, involving Korean, Vietnamese, and other languages also historically involved with Chinese.

3. The problems of training effective language teachers, particularly effective native speakers, are substantial; there is no lack of enthusiasm on the part of certain institutions for attempting such training, but unfortunately such enthusiasm does not correlate well with demonstrated resources and expertise--in plain English, those most eager to undertake such activities do not always seem to be those who know the most about them, and vice versa. The problem is to interest those institutions with substantial experience and research resources in making these available in the form of training programs and allied activities--no easy task, since the more one learns about the business the less eager one generally is to tackle problems of pedagogy.
4. The critical need for uniform testing and evaluation standards remains, with no visible progress over the past two decades; again, only the Foreign Service Institute has any substantial experience and background in this area, but it remains isolated from the academic community.
5. The consensus of the meetings was that our problem is teaching, and studying, one Japanese language, not several (i.e., our students should and must learn Japanese--not "economics Japanese," "history Japanese," "political science Japanese"); and that effective mastery of Japanese in this sense is a concept with which most discipline and "area" specialists need increased familiarity.
6. The attractive possibilities of supplementing basic classroom instruction with the resources of TV, and other more sophisticated electronic aids, remain largely unexplored, and might very well offer an attractive area for binational cooperation (and expenditure).

7h: ANNEX A

Participants

James T. Araki, University of Hawaii
 Hamako Chaplin, Yale University
 John J. Chew, Jr., University of Toronto
 Mantaro Hashimoto, Visiting Lecturer, Princeton University
 Eleanor H. Jorden, Foreign Service Institute, U.S. Department
 of State
 Samuel E. Martin, Yale University
 Roy Andrew Miller, Yale University
 Andrew H. Nelson, Loma Linda University, La Sierra Campus

Tamako Niwa, University of Washington
Shoichi Oguro, Tokyo, Japan
Barbara Ruch, University of Pennsylvania
Marleigh M. Ryan, Columbia University
Kay K. Ryland, Social Science Research Council
Hiroshi Sakamoto, Stanford University
Takeshi Shibata, Tokyo, Japan
David A. Titus, Wesleyan University, Social Science Research
Council
Martin Weinstein, Columbia University, Social Science Research
Council
John Young, University of Hawaii

7h: ANNEX B

Japanese Descriptive Linguistics: Some Areas of Research

by S. E. Martin

1. Standardization problems:

syllable distinctions in flux: sy ≠ hy?, ġ ≠ ġ (≠ ġ̃)?; t^ei ≠ t^yi?, d^ei ≠ z^yi?, hwa ≠ hua ≠ ha?, bwa ≠ bua ≠ ba?, bwi ≠ bui ≠ bi?; senséi = sensée = sense?; compound nigori (-kaisya/-gaisya);...

accent distinctions in flux: basic lexemes (bōku/boku), compound nouns (ziten-sya/ziten-sya; tabemono/tabemono; "atonic" adjectives, compound (and historically atonic long) verbs, oxytonic adverbs, phrasal compounds (dare de mo/dare de mo/dare de mo)

grammar in flux:

N	<u>da</u> /na soô da	N da/ná mono (da kara)
		hazu (da)
N	da/ <u>na</u> no ni	koto (o sitte)
	no de	

A-karoo = A-i daroo, aru mai - nai daroo

• • •

2. Sociolinguistic problems: uptown ≠ downtown; city ≠ countryside; Tokyo ≠ Japan; local standards; men ≠ women ≠ children; deictic and pronominal reference; sentence stylization and honorifics; slang, argot, quasi-literary forms,...

3. Syntactic problems: basic sentence structures, predicate case-valences; thematization and focus, adnominalization and nominalization, anaphoric and cataphoric devices; quantification and adverbializations; recursive features

and the limits of multiple recursion; verbal aspect, auxiliary formation, and constraints on predicates; conjoining, sharing, and ellipsis; reduction and insertion of junctures with concomitant accent reduction and loss; desentential lexemes;...extensive statistical studies of authentic texts,...

4. Semantic problems: Japanese logic, as found in the language-specific grammar, contrasted with "natural" logic as deduced from a theory of universal grammar, the hierarchical organization of the Japanese cognitive world as revealed by component sets within the lexicon; ...
5. Lexicographical problems: adequate coverage of semantic components (how do you "count" the noun?), word derivation (live and frozen), derivational accentuation, syntactic properties (including case valences), etymology; translational dictionaries;...
6. Orthographic problems: unofficial characters and unofficial uses of official characters, shapes of characters and dictionary classification of them, send-off kana, foreignisms, prescribed uses of katakana,...
7. Language acquisition: by monolingual and by bilingual children, with special attention to the order of acquiring underlying syntactic phenomena as well as their surface markings
8. Dialects, main-island and Ryukyu: areal surveys and specific studies in depth; accurate basic lexicons--romanized with accentuation marked, syntactic, morphological, and lexicological peculiarities; detailed comparative-historical studies, especially in the Ryukyus;...

7h: ANNEX C

The History of Japanese: Some Areas of Research

by R. A. Miller

Fortunately, this field has been so neglected, both in Japan and abroad, that there is virtually no danger of duplication of effort--anything that is done in the future will necessarily be a step ahead. The following suggestions are accordingly only a small selection culled from an all but infinite range of possibilities. Ordering of statement is, unless otherwise indicated below, mostly random.

1. External history of the language:

Writing a series of comparative grammars (here and below

in the technical sense of "vergleichende Grammatik") covering the phonology morphology, and syntax of (1) the Japanese dialects surviving on the home-islands--this must be preceded by useful descriptions of these dialects, which we now mostly lack, and also of (2) the Japanese dialects and languages-related-to-Japanese surviving in the surrounding area (Ryūkyūs, etc.).

Reconstruction of proto-Japanese on the basis of the comparative grammars of (1) and (2) above.

Writing a comparative grammar of proto-Japanese/proto-Korean/proto-Tungus/proto-Altaic.

Solution of the problem of the relation of Japanese to other language families, notably to Altaic.

Much of the comparative work required is already well in hand, e.g., for Tungus, Mongol, Turkic, and Altaic generally; principal tasks remain in Japanese and Korean.

2. Internal history of the language:

Writing a series of synchronic monographs on the (1) phonology, (2) morphology, (3) syntax of each major stage of the language; initially, aiming at descriptions in depth of O(ld) J(apanese), late OJ, M(iddle) J(apanese), late MJ, early N(ew) J(apanese), and NJ--though precise periods are a problem in themselves.

Work on the problem of periodicization of the history of Japanese: is it not possible to free ourselves from the wholly artificial system of using art history/sociological/political periods for linguistic history, which we have inherited from traditional Japanese scholarship?

Writing a series of diachronic monographs tracing individual features/form classes/segments of form classes, etc., through several or more periods of the language's history [note that this is predicated upon the synchronic monographs noted above, as well as on at least a temporary solution of the periodicization problems]: thus, "case particles from OJ through late MJ," "ga/no possessives from MJ to NJ"--note that a useful (and probably necessary) intermediate (bzw. temporizing) stage will probably be synchronic monographs on individual features at particular times in history [the present level of most of the secondary literature in Japanese]: e.g., "iku/kuru in Tanizaki," etc. [good for MAs and the like].

Work on I(nternal) R(econstruction), deriving what can be learned of the history of the language from its own structure; correlation of IR results with above.

3. Misc. and Tools:

Monographs suggested above will lead naturally to teaching aids, texts, drill-books, readers (which must have accurate vocabularies and glosses) for earlier stages of the language; we also need accurately annotated readers of Japanese secondary literature on the history of the language to train students in this field; precise and accurate bibliographies bzw. summaries of the Japanese secondary literature badly needed; linguistically more satisfactory eds. of all Japanese texts needed, with more information on actual Mss. readings (not normalized by editors); re-editing all Japanese dictionaries of Chinese loanwords to establish "real" loans as distinguished from Meiji-Taishō lexicographical ghost readings; series of Japanese translations of foreign works on history of Japanese, also other tools such as Lewin's Abriss, Wenck's Phonetik, etc., so that maybe even Americans can then read them.

APPENDIX 71

Conference on Japanese Language Training

October 6-7, 1969, SSRC, New York

I. INTRODUCTION

A conference on Japanese language training, with Eleanor H. Jorden of the Foreign Service Institute (presently Visiting Professor at Cornell) as Chairman, was held at the offices of the Social Science Research Council on October 6-7, 1969. Present at the conference were eleven scholars and specialists in Japanese language teaching, an observer from Inter-University Southeast Asia Committee, and two members of the SSRC staff (see Annex A).

II. GENERAL BACKGROUND OF THE CONFERENCE

At the meeting of the Joint Committee on Japanese Studies, at Estes Park, Colorado, in August 1969, the urgency of the Japanese language training problem became apparent. A recurring theme in all the reports of the seven Sub-committee Meetings held during 1968-69 had been the problem of bringing students to an adequate Japanese language competence for research in their chosen disciplines. In the past, the field has been able to draw on the considerable number of people who lived in Japan during their early life and/or who graduated from intensive language programs offered during the last war. The student of today who wants to enter the Japanese field faces a formidable task. In order to learn Japanese sufficiently well to permit him to use the language substantively in his disciplinary field he must expend a far greater amount of time than it would take him to reach a comparable degree of proficiency in most other major languages of the world. But he can rarely allot sufficient time with sufficient intensity to do the job efficiently. Instead, he pursues his language studies on a part-time basis at the same time as courses in his special discipline and accordingly cannot utilize the results of language acquisition since he is still in the stage of acquiring. This is the situation that has given rise to critical comments by professors in the disciplines on the language competence of their students, and to an apparently widespread feeling of linguistic inadequacy among the students themselves.

Such a situation can only have an adverse effect on student recruitment. Unless there is progress toward a solution to the language problem, it will become increasingly difficult to attract superior students in numbers sufficient to the needs of the field.

In view of the relevance of Japanese proficiency to all disciplinary scholarship, and the recognized urgency of the problems being encountered, the Joint Committee approved a suggestion that this preliminary conference devoted exclusively to the subject of language training be organized as promptly as possible under the auspices of the SSRC.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESOLUTIONS OF THE CONFERENCE

As means of working out a solution to the language problem, the members of the conference discussed the kind of program that might be called "a workable model"--i.e., one that would definitely offer significant improvement in problem areas but at the same time be possible of realization.

The following recommendations were made:

1. A national institute should be established within the United States where students can receive elementary language training on an intensive (i.e. full-time) basis. Such an institute should not be attached to any one university, but should be an independent institution, open to all persons who can meet the established standards. Students enrolled at the institute would pursue only their language course; all other courses and research would be postponed until completion of study at the institute. Language classes would meet for approximately 30 hours per week and in addition considerable outside work would be required.

For those who successfully completed six months at the institute, continuing intensive training on an intermediate level would be offered in Japan. Also available at the Japan Center would be advanced specialized training for the student engaged in doctoral research.

For students beginning their intensive language training in June, at the conclusion of an academic year, a six-month course in the States followed immediately by a nine-month course in Japan would postpone disciplinary courses for only one academic year, but would enable students to enroll in such courses after having already gained a solid foundation in Japanese.

It was emphasized that such a language institute would supplement university programs, not be a replacement for them. The universities would continue to recruit future specialists in their part-time elementary courses, and would offer advanced training in disciplinary reading and discussion to the student returned from Japan.

The programs of the institute in the U.S. and the Center

in Japan would of necessity be flexible, responding to the needs of individual students. Some, who had begun their Japanese in high school or as undergraduates, might prove eligible for acceptance at the Japan Center after less than six months or without any training at the institute. Others might take the 15-month training period as an undergraduate junior-year-abroad program. Still others might enroll immediately after concluding their undergraduate work, before beginning graduate course work.

From outside the group of specialists in Japanese affairs, there would undoubtedly be doctors, lawyers, physical scientists, businessmen, etc., with a need for an intensive Japanese language program, who would avail themselves of the kind of program an institute would offer.

The program of the Japan facility would be carefully coordinated with that of the institute to provide a unified course of study. In regard to the present Tokyo facility for advanced training, concern was voiced over its threatened discontinuation at a time when Japanese language teaching needs strengthening. A resolution was passed endorsing the operation of the Center and indicating concern over its possible closing.

There was general endorsement of programs like the Critical Language Program, now being supported by HEW, which makes it possible for students to begin the study of Japanese on a self-study basis in colleges (and some high schools) which do not have resident Japanese staffs. A resolution was passed by the group strongly encouraging pre-college programs.

The standards of the programs both in the institute and the Japan Center would be high. One of the functions of the elementary program would be to serve as a screening device: the poor language learner would be discovered quickly and could adjust his program away from the language, prior to a lengthy investment of time and effort that yielded unsatisfactory results.

There seemed to be general agreement that an institute for elementary training should be located in the United States, rather than in Japan. The student who has already acquired a solid, accurate basis in the language is much better able to make rapid, orderly progress through everyday contact with the language when he reaches Japan. In contrast, the completely untrained student who arrives in a foreign country and is exposed to the gamut of structure and vocabulary from his first day of contact, is forced to cope with language shock and general culture shock simultaneously. This appears to be a significantly less efficient approach. The period in the States should not be overly long--hence the suggestion for a program of about six months' duration--but experience suggests that such a period is of great value.

2. Recommended for inclusion within the proposed language training institute was a division of research. One of the problems of highest priority for such a facility should be the question of student evaluation and program standards. Unless an objective gauge is agreed upon, our references to "poor programs," "excellent results," "remarkable progress," etc., are meaningless. Even the terms "elementary," "intermediate," and "advanced" students are confusing when used among people from different institutions.

The Foreign Service Institute has long been engaged in the measurement of foreign language proficiency among State Department employees but their tests are expensive and difficult to administer. What is desperately needed is an objective testing system which can provide meaningful assessments of student performance on the basis of a more easily administered test. On this subject, the following resolution was passed: Standardized measurement of Japanese language proficiency is essential to improvement of our programs. Research must be devoted toward the creation of an accurate and efficient testing system. Consideration should be given to the formation of a committee to begin work in this area, with representation from the Kokuritsu-Kenkyūjo.

Other critical projects for the research division would be: (1) the preparation of teaching materials for both speaking and reading at the so-called intermediate level; (2) the preparation of teachers' manuals to accompany texts now in use; (3) reproduction and distribution of various advanced texts for which publication money is not available. Recommendations for these projects were included in resolutions passed by the conference group.

There was also interest in obtaining tapes and video-tapes from Japan for use as language study materials. The research division of the institute could serve as a general clearing-house for all such materials.

3. The third division within the institute would be a division of teacher training. The necessity for such a facility became evident during a discussion of the problems encountered by the Japanese language teacher working at an American university. Because of the strict rules established by the AAUP, it is impossible for language teachers who do not hold advanced degrees in a discipline to become professors with tenure. Regardless of how capable they are as teachers, their opportunities for advancement within an academic structure are extremely limited.

Under the system which exists at present, it is perfectly possible for a poorly qualified language teacher who happens to hold a degree in an unrelated field to be promoted over a well qualified colleague, only because of a totally irrelevant degree. The situation is such that recruitment is becoming

increasingly difficult, and the quality of teaching suffering as a result.

Suggestions for recruitment of teachers in Japan and a system of rotation after one or two years of work, while worth pursuing further, do not solve the problem of the need for senior teachers who are thoroughly experienced. It is this very group that is most seriously affected by an inequitable system.

As one means of improving the general situation, the establishment of a teachers' training division within the new institute was recommended. A program comparable to those university programs that lead to a master's degree in the teaching of English (or other European languages) as a foreign language would be offered, with opportunities for practice teaching provided by the intensive programs at the institute. Satisfactory completion of the course should provide graduates with acceptable credentials for language teaching positions and would hopefully help to upgrade their status as well as their teaching capability. Such a training program would be of great assistance to most universities, where facilities for teacher training are extremely limited.

But the general status situation calls for more immediate action. A resolution was passed, urging that the Joint Committee support a move to improve the status of Japanese language teachers. Their job security and promotion potential should be comparable to that of regular faculty members; they must be evaluated on the basis of their language teaching qualifications and skills, not on their publications and advanced degrees in a discipline; and it must be recognized that a specialist in literature or in any other particular discipline is not qualified, through that specialty, to evaluate the performance of a language teacher.

A complete survey of the current situation at American universities is urgently needed as a preliminary step to defining qualifications and improving inequities.

IV. FINANCIAL RESOURCES

The establishment of a national institute for the teaching of Japanese would require long-term funding in order to produce recognizable results. Obviously, the most desirable arrangement would be support by a major foundation on a long-term basis.

The growing indications that the need for a language institute is not limited to the Japanese field suggest that it might be appropriate to consider an independent intensive language center, that would offer instruction in several critical

languages. The presence at our meetings of Professor R. B. Jones, Jr., of Cornell, representing the Inter-University Southeast Asia Committee, indicated the concern of the latter group with the language problem in their area. A demonstrated need extending over a broad linguistic area might attract the financial support of a large foundation more than a small institution that would attack the problems of only one language.

The alternative would be the establishment of a small institute for Japanese only, comparable in size to the present advanced center in Tokyo. Gradual expansion to include other languages could then be considered at a later date.

Possible financial contributors other than foundations would be HEW, associations of small universities, and business corporations interested in enrolling their personnel. HEW has already been approached for funds to continue operation of the present Tokyo Center, and is also contributing to the Critical Language Program.

The institute itself would earn income from student tuitions and scholarship monies, assuming that it would be accredited and approved for enrollment under government scholarship sponsorships. Further revenue would be realized if the institute could provide a testing service for evaluating student performance.

The consensus of the group was that if the program has merit as a potential solution to the Japanese language problem, funds for its implementation must be sought.

71: ANNEX A

List of Participants

Kenneth Butler, Inter-University Center for Japanese Studies,
Tokyo
Hamako Chaplin, Yale University
R. B. Jones, Jr., Cornell University (representing ISAC)
Eleanor H. Jordan, Foreign Service Institute, U.S. Dept. of
State, and Cornell University
Akira Komai, University of Wisconsin
Susumu Kuno, Harvard University
Samuel E. Martin, Yale University and University of Hawaii
Susumu Nagara, University of Michigan
Tamako Niwa, University of Washington
Ichiro Shirato, Columbia University
David A. Titus, Wesleyan University and SSRC
Martin Weinstein, Columbia University and SSRC
John Young, University of Hawaii
Muneo Yoshikawa, University of Hawaii

71: ANNEX B

On the Teaching of Japanese: The State of the Art

(A paper prepared by Samuel E. Martin for ERIC, Educational Resources Information Center, Washington, D.C.)

Until the coming of World War II little interest was shown in the teaching of Japanese outside Japan except for the elementary schools set up to inculcate the ways of the homeland among the offspring of Japanese emigrants to places like Hawaii, the Pacific Coast of North America, and Brazil. In those schools the teaching methods and materials were for the most part adaptations of what was prescribed by the Ministry of Education for elementary schools in Japan. A very few universities in Europe and America offered limited instruction in Japanese, primarily in order to train Orientalists interested in pursuing philological or historical research; stemming from this period (though published later) are the Elisséeff-Reischauer texts developed at Harvard. The most successful practical instruction for foreigners was that offered in Tokyo by the school of Naoe Naganuma, who developed a comprehensive set of materials to teach both spoken and written Japanese to foreign officials stationed in Tokyo. These materials, which have been revised several times, are still in wide use, not only at the Naganuma School in Tokyo, which now caters to all sorts of foreign students, but also at a number of other places. By and large, the materials have been superannuated by newer tools developed along the lines of the methodological advances made in second-language teaching in the United States during and after the War; yet a number of our universities have been slow to take advantage of newer approaches. (The principal defects of the Naganuma course are these: inadequate drill and explication of basic spoken sentence patterns; lack of clear-cut distinction between spoken and written language; text material that is overly long and poorly focused; a heavy vocabulary load that is ill controlled, little drilled, and abounding in hapax legomena. The principal asset is the ready availability of the entire set of well-printed "Readers" with auxiliary apparatus such as drill cards, notes, etc.).

World War II led to massive programs for training military personnel, notably the Army program at the University of Michigan and the Navy program that centered at the University of Colorado; both of these programs used the Naganuma materials, supplemented by locally produced aids. The ASTP programs at several universities developed materials of their own, the most lastingly successful being those created at Yale under the direction of Bernard Bloch and Eleanor Harz Jorden. Published under the title Spoken Japanese (SJ), the Yale course became a standard classroom tool for teaching the spoken language until the appearance of Beginning Japanese (BJ) by Jorden and Chaplin in 1962. The audiolingual methodology in both

these books is part of a continuing mainstream of spoken-language pedagogy that can be succinctly characterized as ACLS-ASTP-FSI-MLA. Although some of the material in SJ is dated and there are a number of shortcomings (unnaturalness in some of the material--a common failure in textbooks of Asian languages; minimal treatment of speech levels; somewhat heavy vocabulary load), the book is still used as a basic text in a number of places, e.g., Columbia.

The Jorden and Chaplin text (BJ) has proved something of a milestone. A carefully crafted presentation of authentic modern Japanese with extensive drills on sentence patterns, it is extremely effective when used as intended. The very fine tape recordings which are available to accompany the text make it possible for bright students to master much of the material without the amount of tutorial attention that most other courses require, though these remarks do not mean that the tapes are to be regarded as a substitute for a well-trained and talented tutor. A number of later texts have been closely modeled on the approach of BJ, notably Niwa and Matuda's Basic Japanese for College Students (1964). (A new audiolingual course prepared by a group of Japanese linguists has just appeared in Tokyo as part of the TEC series, but I have not had the chance to examine it.)

Certain questions that once seemed burning to teachers and students of Japanese are now practically dead. When did we last hear one of those heated discussions of the impossibility of learning to pronounce Fuji if confronted with the spelling Huzi? There is not a symbol in conflict between the Hepburn-type Romanizations in traditional use and the Japan-type Romanizations favored by the innovators; the student must learn to recognize words written in both ways, and whether he prefers to write in one or the other (or neither) is of little consequence. Indeed, only esthetics are harmed by mixing the two indiscriminately, since neither *Fuzi nor *Huzi is susceptible to more than a single interpretation! Ultimately the student makes a stab at learning the norms for syllabary-and-character "mixed script" as prescribed by the Ministry of Education, but those norms too turn out to be ideals that can be variously twisted and abused with no great harm done, though an attempt to live up to such ideal standards--like living up to all ideals--is certainly worth encouraging, especially on the part of teachers.

Still often debated is the question of which syllabary to teach first, the square-shaped katakana or the more intricately flowing hiragana. Following modern educationalist trends in Japan, Naganuma starts off with the hiragana, on the grounds that it is more widely used; he gradually introduces the katakana as foreign loanwords are inserted in the lesson texts. Because of the large-scale influx of loans in recent years, the frequency with which katakana hits the eye has risen considerably, however, and in Japanese educationalist

circles this had led to an argument in favor of returning to the introduction of katakana first. Since both syllabaries must be mastered very early in the process of learning to read, it really matters little which the foreign student faces first; but the greater ease with which the clumsy-handed foreigner can learn the shape components and stroke-order of katakana make that system perhaps preferable for his initial exposure to the active dynamics of the writing system. (Most teachers favor an active approach to the symbols, i.e., learning to write them properly as well as recognize them; in practice, however, few courses insist on this. Here is an area calling for research and new ideas.)

It now hardly seems open to question that all instruction should begin with some exposure to the spoken language, but there are conflicting views on when and how--or even whether--to introduce the writing system. At one time, linguists were perhaps overly cautious about the pernicious effect that they assumed would be brought to bear on the acquisition of audio-lingual skills if the student was introduced to the script too soon. Books such as SJ and BJ (and many others) were written with the assumption that the written language would be taught as a quite separate entity--ideally, after the completion of the basic spoken-language instruction. In practice, of course, anyone who plans to undertake the writing system (as most do) had better get started early, simply to cover the necessary ground; one of the headaches of university courses in Japanese and Chinese is the fact that the complexities of the writing systems obligate the student to devote from two to three times as much effort and time as is required to master a comparable level of overall proficiency in languages making use of only an alphabetic script, however complicated the orthographic quirks to which such a script may be subject. The Manual of Japanese Writing (MJW) was published by Chaplin and Martin in 1967 to introduce the essential 881 characters required by Japanese elementary schools. While apparently quite effective when used after the Jordan and Chaplin texts, or when used for review, the book will probably cause some difficulties when the lessons are introduced alongside early work in spoken Japanese, since no effort was made to simplify the normal sentence structures met in written Japanese (though the notes attempt to clarify the difficulties), nor to substitute spoken synonyms for words that are common in written Japanese but are seldom heard in speech. Several recent texts (e.g., Modern Japanese by Mieko S. Han and Learn Japanese by John Young and Kimiko Nakajima) have attempted to integrate learning of the written forms with the acquisition of the spoken structure; it is perhaps too early to decide how effective these particular approaches can be when used as intended.

After many years of major gaps in teaching materials, we are now fortunate to have so many different books available. In order to give some idea of what I feel is the best of what is available, let me offer the following rough idea of what I

would recommend for various levels of university instruction (with no negative recommendation intended for works not mentioned). I assume four semesters of foundation work, with classroom instruction of from eight to ten hours each week, or the equivalent; I also assume a good deal of homework study of the writing system.

1. FOUNDATION WORK

- Jorden and Chaplin: Beginning Japanese, 2 vols. Yale, 1962-63.
 O'Neill: Japanese Kana Workbook, Kodansha International (Tokyo), 1968.
 Chaplin and Martin: Manual of Japanese Writing, 3 vols. Yale Press, 1967.
 Sakade: A Guide to Reading and Writing Japanese, rev. ed. Tokyo, 1961.

2. CONTINUING WORK

a. READING:

- Hibbett-Itasaka: Modern Japanese, A Basic Reader, 2 vols. Harvard, 1965.
 Selection from Miller: A Japanese Reader. Tokyo, 1962.
 Selections from Gendai Nihon Bungaku Eiyaku Senshū, 20 vols., with English and Japanese facing texts and notes. Tokyo, 1964 et seq.

DICTIONARIES:

- Nelson's Japanese-English Character Dictionary.
 Sanseido's Japanese-English Pocket Dictionary.
 Kenkyusha's Japanese-English Dictionary.

b. SPOKEN:

- Alfonso: Japanese Language Patterns. 2 vols., Tokyo, 1966.
 Review drills in BJ.
 Chaplin, Nihommatsu, and Martin: Advanced Japanese Conversation. Yale Press, 1969?
 O'Neill: A Programmed Course on Respect Language in Modern Japanese. London, 1966.
 NHK tapes. See Journal-Newsletter ATJ 4/1.72 (1966).
 Videotapes--if available.

3. ADVANCED WORK

- O'Neill: A Programmed Introduction to Literary-Style Japanese. London, 1968.
 Lewin: Japanische Chrestomathie. Wiesbaden, 1965.
 Ashikaga: Gyō-Sō Tokuhon. Berkeley, 1944.

- Yamagiwa: Readings in Japanese History, 2 vols. Ann Arbor, 1966.
- Yamagiwa et al.: Readers for Pre-Modern Japanese Literature and History. Ann Arbor, 1966.
- Yamagiwa et al.: Readings in Japanese Language and Linguistics. Ann Arbor, 1965.
- Yamagiwa et al.: Readings in Japanese Literature. Ann Arbor, 1965.
- Yamagiwa et al.: Readings in Japanese Political Science. Ann Arbor, 1965.
- Yamagiwa et al.: Readings in Japanese Social Anthropology and Sociology. Ann Arbor, 1966.
- Henderson: Handbook of Japanese Grammar, rev. ed. New York, 1948.
- Sansom: An Historical Grammar of Japanese. Oxford, 1928.
- Miller: The Japanese Language. Chicago, 1967.

DICTIONARIES:

- Kindaichi: Meikai kokugo ziten. Tokyo.
- Kindaichi: Meikai kogo ziten, rev. ed. Tokyo, 1968.
- Shimmura: Koo-zien. Tokyo, 1955.
- Daniels: Dictionary of Japanese (sōsho) Writing Forms. London, 1944 et seq.
- O'Neill: A comprehensive index of Japanese names. Tokyo, 1969?
- Abolmasov and Nemzer: Slovar' yaponskikh geograficheskikh nazvaniy [Dictionary of Japanese geographical names]. Moscow, 1959.
- Goedertier: A dictionary of Japanese history. Tokyo, 1968.
- Goedertier: A dictionary of Japanese biography. Tokyo, 1968.
- Goedertier: A dictionary of Japanese geography. Tokyo, 1968.

There are other texts and reference works which could be added, but I will forego mentioning them here. Instead, I will spell out a few criticisms that have been made of some of the cited works and point to some gaps that remain. BJ has been criticized for the following features: a heavy vocabulary load, with early emphasis on items of immediate interest only to those living in Japan rather than to those studying abroad (e.g., comprehensive coverage of the numeral system very early); too much respect language (keigo) too soon, yet what seems like inadequate exposition in later lessons where it might be more appropriate; an unnecessarily complicated system of marking certain phonetic features (notably the accent). Criticisms of MJW include: uncompromisingly difficult syntax from the very beginning; lack of ACTIVE drills, quizzes, and the like, with over-reliance on the student's initiative to make use of the given materials as active drills; Book III poorly edited and printed--largely owing to the peculiar strictures of the Office of Education with respect to cold-

and-hot printing; poorly edited typing in the Romanized versions of the Text Lessons in Book I. The set of annotated disciplinary readers produced by Yamagiwa and associates have proved disappointing to a number who have tried to use them not only because of the unfortunately idiosyncratic Romanization used in the notes but also because of the inaccuracy of many of the glosses, which would seem to indicate inadequate supervision of the attention paid to context on the part of native speakers who prepared the annotations.

Current needs include the following:

- Well-planned active drill materials for advanced spoken Japanese.
- Romanized versions of selected NHK tapes with accent and juncture marked.
- A thoroughly indexed reference grammar with emphasis on problems of syntax.
- Basic research on case valences (particle-predicate ties), verb aspect, and prosodic features.
- Up-to-date studies of flux in the standard language, with consideration of items of regional grammar and vocabulary that are widely used, and of the problems in maintaining such distinctions as those of nasal vs. oral g. hy vs. sy. tonic vs. atonic adjective patterns, etc.
- Detailed lexicographical studies of internal word structure.
- A comprehensive and well-indexed dictionary of Japanese place-names designed for English-speaking students (cf. the Russian work cited above and the Cincpac-Cincpoa Bulletin No. 159-49 of August 1945 also known as "FADTMACK").
- An active drill book to accompany MJW.
- An advanced counterpart to MJW to teach the remainder of the 1850 standard characters (Tōkyō kanji).
- Revision and/or reprinting of certain out-of-print works (e.g., Ashikaga cited above).
- New materials to teach the dynamics of writing characters in the several forms of handwriting.
- Materials designed to present Japanese in the most effective manner to those students who already know Chinese.

I have not gone into the differing needs of courses for schools below the college level. There are several groups at work creating materials for such courses, notably at the University of Hawaii. Some doubt has arisen as to the wisdom of encouraging the widespread teaching of Japanese at lower levels, because of the lack of teachers trained to do an effective job and the uneven talents of the students electing the courses. At the present time, in order to avoid the waste of relatively limited resources, at all levels it would seem advisable to discourage the interest in Japanese of those stu-

dents whose language-learning potential is low. Institutions offering Japanese-language instruction should concentrate on quality rather than quantity, and it may be necessary to educate their administrations to the desirability of this attitude.

A big step forward came with the formation of the Association of Teachers of Japanese (ATJ), and the publication of the Journal-Newsletter of the Association which began in 1963. The association now has 225 individual members (including a number in Japan and Europe), and the total circulation of the Journal-Newsletter is about 250 copies for each of the three numbers published every year. The Association arranges two programs during the year as part of the meetings of the Association for Asian Studies in the spring and of the Modern Language Association in December; the programs, which usually include an invited panel of speakers and discussants, have been well attended and much appreciated. Many of the stimulating papers that are offered on language and literature later find their place in the Journal-Newsletter.

In addition to special schools such as the Armed Forces Language School and the Foreign Service Institute, nearly fifty American universities are known to be teaching Japanese on a fairly regular basis at the present time. For many institutions, the effort is on a very small scale; at the University of Hawaii, on the other hand, Japanese is the major foreign language elected by the undergraduates. We can expect a continuing growth of interest in Japanese, probably at a gradually accelerating rate, both in America and elsewhere. In Japan itself there are a number of institutions actively engaged in the teaching of Japanese to foreign students and a growing interest in the field of teaching Japanese as a second language; this complements the longstanding and widespread interest in the teaching of English as a second language. The Japanese government has recently begun to show concern about the teaching of Japanese to foreigners but there are no signs that this concern is likely to be implemented in any way that will be of use to those teaching Japanese in America.

In Japan there are said to be about 500 members of the "Society for teaching Japanese as a Foreign Language," many of whom have participated in the one-week Naganuma teacher training course or in the one-year teacher training course that is part of the regular program at International Christian University. The Japanese society puts out a publication Nihongo Kyōiku ("Journal of Japanese language teaching"), apparently at irregular intervals. Closer cooperation between the society in Japan and its American counterpart would seem desirable; for example, it might be possible to let members of each group regularly receive the journal of the other. Aside from the Naganuma school and other private institutions, current programs of language study in Japan center at such institutions as International Christian University, Waseda University, Keio

University, and Sophia (Jōchi) University. The Kokusai Gakuyū-kai ("International Friends Association") offers language training to large numbers of students mostly from South-east Asia, under the auspices of the Japanese government, and their readers have enjoyed use in Japan almost as widespread as the Naganuma materials; the I.C.U. materials (Modern Japanese for University Students) are also well known. The Inter-University Center for Japanese Studies administered by Stanford University provides a year of advanced language training in Tokyo for graduate students from America; at present there are about twenty students, but twice that number could be accommodated without expanding their facilities. At the Center they are experimenting with the use of the relatively inexpensive TV tape recorders and cameras now available. Japanese television provides a wealth of excellent material for language study, especially at advanced levels. The surprising extent to which characters appear on the TV screen suggests the possibility of developing an integrated approach to the learning of both characters and vocabulary. In particular, the running headlines and summaries that accompany the colloquially paraphrased news reports offer an excellent opportunity to grasp meaning through simultaneous stimuli of eyes and ears. (With the TV tape recorder it is possible to see and hear a given scene repeatedly--and to stop a scene at any point; this is an advantage over live television.)

Some of the calligraphy lessons shown on Japanese educational television would be of value in giving even beginners a real feel for the dynamics of writing, brought home by slow-motion repetitions of brushwork. As it becomes less troublesome and less expensive to use the TV tape recorder in Japanese language classes in America, we would like to see established some agency to facilitate the regular acquisition of tapes from Japan, either directly from the stations or from some group that would tape from the air on demand.

Although increasing numbers of students are arriving in Japan without previous exposure to the language, it seems to be widely agreed that the American student does well to begin his language study in the United States, going to Japan only for advanced work. (The elementary language training also serves as a good screening process, to the extent that the results are available to sponsoring agencies.) There is a shortage of well-trained teachers on both sides of the Pacific. The most acute demand in American universities is for the scholar trained in applying linguistic science to the analysis of Japanese and to the organization of effective language courses; at the same time there is a need for native speakers who are trained to drill students in the language with skill and enthusiasm. Because of the rapid changes taking place in all parts of Japanese culture, it is important for the teachers to visit Japan at frequent intervals in order to freshen their language and update their knowledge. Perhaps tutor exchanges between American institutions and their counterparts

in Japan--for a year or just a term--will provide stimulation for both sides if they can be arranged as a regular pattern. The retraining of present teachers is no less important than the training of new ones; in particular, many of the present teachers would benefit from a program that helped them aim toward a more ACTIVE coverage of the drill material that they are often accustomed to going over in a passive way. The cogent remarks on teacher inadequacies made in the Miller report seem to have passed unheeded and the "state of the art" in the average classroom has hardly changed from the situation he deplored in 1964. Some very interesting observations on teaching Japanese to American students will be found in Miss Matsuda's new book, Soto kara mita Nihongo (Tokyo, 1968), written while back in Japan on a sabbatical from six years of teaching at the University of Washington. Finally, I should call attention to J. Seward's amusing book Japanese in Action (Tokyo, 1968), which contains lively criticisms--some apt, some inept--of our prevailing approaches to the teaching of Japanese along with a number of valuable pointers about the language and culture, as observed by a knowledgeable foreigner.

APPENDIX 7J

Outline of Contacts Between Japanese
and American Lawyers

(Communication from Dan F. Henderson,
University of Washington)

Contacts between Japanese and American lawyers have increased over the years with the increase of trade, investment and travel. The chief contacts have been of two sorts. The first might be called academic exchanges, including professional associations, and the second are the associations arising out of professional work of lawyers on both sides of the Pacific. The need for the latter associations was recognized in the early years after World War II and implemented in Japan by regulations allowing American lawyers to become members of the Japanese Bar in a special category qualifying them to advise American clients, or Japanese clients on American law. About 70 lawyers were admitted to the Japanese bar, and once admitted, commenced to organize firms of bilingual and bilingal lawyers associated together to solve the difficult legal problems which both American and Japanese have had in conducting their trans-Pacific economic relations wherein both Japanese and American law may be applicable, often in conflicting ways. Such bilingual and bilingal law firms containing both Japanese and American lawyers number perhaps a dozen in Japan, and a half a dozen in the major centers of the United States. I have described the work and the associations of these lawyers on the professional level in 38 Washington Law Review 1-20 (1963).

The academic associations began soon after the war ended, when among most of the annual groups of Fulbright students that came to the United States, generally one or two lawyers or law professors were included.

Then, in 1954 through 1961, a program of exchanges between lawyers, judges and law professors from the United States and Japan took place with Harvard, Stanford and Michigan from this side, and Chuo, Keio, Kyoto, Tohoku and Tokyo University participating in Japan. Before its end in 1961, the program sponsored a conference at Harvard, the papers from which eventuated in a volume entitled LAW IN JAPAN (von Mehren, editor) published in 1963. The Asian Law Program, School of Law, University of Washington, was in a sense a sequel to the prior program. It was supported by the Ford Foundation for the purpose of focusing at one institution comparative law efforts in United States/Japanese and later Chinese problems. The Asian Law Program has focused on bilingual students who are already lawyers, in an effort to teach them something of the law of Japan (or the United States, for Japanese lawyers) and develop a confidence for handling United States/Japanese legal prob-

lems. Several dozen lawyers have participated in the program, and these persons are now active as specialists in both Japan and the United States. Finally, the JAPANESE AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR LEGAL STUDIES was organized in 1965, and has a membership of some 400 lawyers in Japan, and roughly 200 members in this country. Its editorial offices are at the University of Washington, and it publishes an annual called "LAW IN JAPAN: AN ANNUAL" with the first volume appearing in 1967. The Society also publishes a Japanese language periodical entitled AMERIKA-HO. The Society has organized into Japanese and American branches which are available for hosting legal visitors to the respective countries.

The Japanese Legal Training and Research Institute has a program of nominating Japanese judges and lawyers to host institutions in this country. Southern Methodist University, Harvard and the University of Washington have regularly invited one or more such nominees. Another formally organized project is the research and publication project jointly sponsored by the Asian Law Program (University of Washington) and the Japanese Institute of Business Law of Tokyo.

APPENDIX 8a

Holdings of Japanese and Chinese Materials
in American Libraries

(Number of Volumes as of December 31, 1968)

(Prepared by T. H. Tsien)

<u>Library</u>	<u>Japanese</u>	<u>Chinese</u>
American Museum (N.Y.)	8,700*	7,200*
Arizona	13,278	29,014
Art Institute (Chicago)	2,300*	200*
Brown	--	49,328
California:		
Berkeley	(126,000)	(150,000)
Center for Chinese Studies	421	15,227
Los Angeles ^a	50,000	142,230
Santa Barbara	6,200	6,850
Center for Res. Libraries ^b	100*	1,598*
Chicago	41,633	166,308
Chinese Library of America	--	15,158
Claremont	11,200	56,300
Cleveland	2,360	10,474
Colorado	5,000*	15,000*
Columbia	93,774	164,691
Cornell	14,972	133,592
Dartmouth	3,500	16,750
DeYoung Museum	1,500*	4,800*
Duke	3,200*	4,600*
Field Museum (Chicago)	900	10,200
Florida	2,000	4,000
Fogg Museum	2,150*	4,324*
Freer	2,251	19,120
Hartford	1,000	3,865
Harvard	108,669	296,185
Hawaii ^c	87,738	76,559
Hinomoto	29,400*	--
Hoover	44,350	99,556
Illinois	16,000	28,000
Indiana	10,107	35,551
Iowa	6,000	22,500
Kansas	10,975	35,508
Library of Congress	485,951	368,081
Maryland	79,061	2,428
Metropolitan Museum (N.Y.)	2,220*	3,180*
Michigan (Ann Arbor)	97,381	97,109
Michigan (East Lansing)	1,248	5,263
Minnesota	7,300	38,063
Monmouth	30	--
Nat. Agricultural Library	20,500	18,200
Nat. Lib. Medicine	12,000	5,650

<u>Library</u>	<u>Japanese</u>	<u>Chinese</u>
New York Public Library	11,166*	9,609*
North Carolina	495	16,860
Northwestern	13,163	15,577
Oberlin	--	3,959
Ohio	1,674	29,593
Oregon	4,983	5,126
Pennsylvania	5,473	29,976
Pittsburgh	1,943	35,816
Princeton	28,713	175,737
Rochester	7,055	15,769
St. John's University	1,200	18,000
Seton Hall	5,200*	9,301*
Texas	12,690	1,646
Toronto	25,950	75,500
Virginia	2,550*	32,624*
Washington (Seattle)	26,856	98,636
Washington (St. Louis)	20,000	25,000
Wisconsin	6,482	53,282
Yale	54,226	107,579
Total	1,641,178	2,922,252

*Figures not up-to-date; those in parentheses are estimated by the investigator.

^aIncluding 80,000 volumes from the Monumenta Serica Collection.

^bHoldings of microfilm or mostly films in number of reels. Each reel is counted as one volume.

^cIncluding 77,845 volumes from the Oriental Library of the University of Hawaii and the collection of the East-West Center Library.

APPENDIX 8b

Fiscal Support of Far Eastern Collections in American Libraries 1968-69

(Prepared by T. H. Tsien)

Source	Books and Serials	Salaries	Others*	<u>Total</u>	
				1968-69	1966-67
Institutions or Universities	\$1,479,837	\$2,249,560	\$285,675	\$4,015,072 88%	\$2,972,597 89%
NDEA	94,975	49,560	--	144,535 4%	156,249 4%
Foundations	206,627	109,982	11,670	328,279 7%	180,052 6%
Endowments and Others	37,166	19,169	3,000	59,335 1%	29,600 1%
Total: 1968-69	\$1,818,605	\$2,428,271	\$300,345	\$4,547,221	
	40%	53%	7%	100%	100%
1966-67	\$1,127,653	\$2,071,642	\$139,203		\$3,338,498
	34%	62%	4%		100%

*Including binding, cards and supplies.

308

325

APPENDIX 8c

Hobbledehoy

by James William Morley

(A Paper Presented to the First Japan-U.S. Conference on Libraries and Information Science in Higher Education, Tokyo, May 16-19, 1969.)

The American specialists on Japan, who depend beyond measure particularly on the American collections of Japanese language materials, are still a relatively small group. Japanese studies, after all, are a recent innovation in America. Although introduced at a few universities more than thirty or forty years ago, it is only over the past twenty years or so that the study of Japan has become a serious part of the curriculum of American higher education. But we are growing rapidly. Over this past twenty years Japanese language courses have been instituted in 55 colleges and universities. The total number of student enrollments in these language courses is today close to 4,000--still far too few for the national need, but nevertheless exercising a significant influence, for around these language students are being organized a number of courses of study relating to Japan in the humanities and social sciences for undergraduates, and from them are rising the graduate students interested in more specialized study. Over this same period, some 500 doctoral dissertations relating to Japan have been accepted by approximately 70 American graduate schools. All of these were not based on vernacular sources, but the number that are so based is growing as significant comprehensive programs of graduate study on Japan are now being offered at a number of American universities.

This growth owes much to the efforts of the pioneer scholars in this field, the encouragement of university administrators, and the financial support of private foundations and government agencies. We owe a very special debt to the librarians: to you librarians here in Japan, who have always so hospitably opened your collections to our use, and to you American librarians, on whom our entire educational and research effort in America most fundamentally rests.

Having acknowledged these debts, I hope you librarians here will permit me as a user of your services, as an admirer of your skills, and as a partner in the general scholarly endeavor, to go on to say that, in all honesty, our Japanese language collections in America are not what they ought to be. They have not kept pace with our scholarly needs.

I am reminded of a little rhyme taught me by my English grandmother. It goes:

Hobbledehoy
 Hobbledehoy
 Not yet a man
 Nor yet a boy

A "hobbledehoy," I believe, was originally a horse which had been hobbled so that it could move only with a very restricted and graceless gate. In the rhyme, it refers to a teen-age youth, who is just gaining a man's physique, but, being unused to his new strength and size, uses it in an ungainly way. Not yet a man and no longer a boy, he moves about awkwardly like a hobbledehoy.

And that, I think, might be a fair description of the immature state of most of our American libraries of Japanese language materials.

A simple count of holdings will indicate one dimension of their inadequacy. I do not have a completely up-to-date count, but as of 1965, if one added together all of the Japanese language holdings in America, one would get only 1,358,821 volumes, and these were scattered in 52 different libraries all over the country with many duplications. The Library of Congress had the largest collection, and at that time, with one exception, no major university center of Japanese studies was supported by a library collection with as many as 100,000 volumes. Most collections were far smaller: the fifth largest had only 70,000; and the tenth largest had only 25,000. And this, it should be remembered, was at a time when more than 50 universities were accepting doctoral dissertations on subjects relating to Japan. Overall size is not the only deficiency. Even these small collections are in many cases inadequately serviced, there being both a shortage of budget and a shortage of trained personnel available to do the work. A few are relatively strong in one field or another because of special bequests or the personal interest of one or more librarians or faculty members who introduced Japanese studies there; but, nearly all are weak in other areas, especially in the social sciences, and none has a well-rounded collection which could support serious research in all fields of our expanding interest.

These remarks are not made to disparage the tireless efforts of the librarians of these collections, but rather to call attention to the seriousness of their problem, and also to their need and the needs of their clients, the American specialists on Japan, for your help.

The situation would seem to call for an overall strategy of development. First of all the goal needs to be identified, then the practical steps to achieve that goal need to be analyzed and undertaken.

I. THE GOAL

What, first of all, should the goal be? What kind of Japanese language collections does American higher education require? I should suggest three.

A. Comprehensive Collections

When two countries mean as much to each other as Japan and the United States do, it is really insupportable that neither country has even one truly comprehensive collection of the publications of the other, available for the use of government officials, scholars, businessmen, writers, and all others of our citizens. It would seem to me that one pressing goal which should be set before each government should be to establish in each country at least one, but preferably three or more, regionally located libraries which are truly comprehensive of the others' publications. These holdings should of course be available on inter-library loan in the original or in facsimile to all other libraries in each country requiring them.

B. Basic Research Collections

Each of the major university centers having comprehensive doctoral programs relating to Japan in the various humanities and social science disciplines should be equipped with a library containing the basic standard works required by any Japanese scholar working in such fields. For unique materials the specialist should be expected to refer to the regional comprehensive collections suggested above and in the last analysis to rely on the libraries in Japan, but he should be able to expect to meet his usual needs and those of his students at his own research center.

C. General Education Collections

With the extension of Japanese studies into undergraduate education throughout the United States, more and more university libraries need to build collections of materials relating to Japan for the use of such college students. Language competence cannot be expected, so that the emphasis will need to be on western language works, but small collections of Japanese language works will be needed to support the research of the specialist faculty members who may be in residence.

II. PRACTICAL STEPS

The achievement of such goals will require considerable time, effort, and money by many Americans in addition to librarians, but it will also require--or at least it would be

aided by--the continued and increased cooperation of our Japanese friends. What practical kinds of cooperation might be envisaged? Let me suggest seven.

A. Enlarged Government-Sponsored Materials Exchange.

For any study of contemporary society, whether it be political, economic, social, or other, government reports are essential sources of information. Particularly as American scholarship has turned to the social sciences and as American professionals, whether businessmen, lawyers, government officials, or other, have developed close ties with their Japanese counterparts, these publications have become more and more vital to American universities. A few years ago an agreement was worked out under which a fairly full run of Japanese government publications would be sent to two repositories, the Library of Congress on the East coast and the University of California Library at Berkeley on the West coast, and a much smaller run to a restricted number of centers elsewhere. This has not proved entirely satisfactory for a number of reasons. One is that these collections are not well enough serviced, so that irregularities in supply go unnoticed for long periods of time. A second is that the selection of materials to be acquired has not been kept under constant review on both sides to make sure that the materials that are being sent are really the materials needed by American users. A third is that the publications from which these exchange materials are selected generally do not include items known in the Japanese trade as hibaihin, that is "materials not for sale." This is not because such materials are necessarily classified; most simply are produced for free or private distribution rather than for sale through commercial channels. Since such government publications are voluminous and often of high value for research, their general exclusion from the official exchange arrangement is a serious defect. Finally, even if these problems were solved, it must be recognized that the United States is simply too large and the important centers of research are simply too scattered geographically for only two relatively comprehensive collections to be sufficient.

It would seem to me very likely that Japanese scholars for their part face a number of problems also, possibly similar, possibly different, in getting adequate access to American government publications. If that is true, is it not time to conduct a serious, high level re-examination of this exchange arrangement, aiming at increasing the number of comprehensive repositories of Japanese government documents in the United States and, if desired, of American government documents in Japan, keeping under constant review the particular materials which are desired on both sides, and guaranteeing their constant servicing.

In addition to government publications, if the goal of several comprehensive collections of Japanese publications is

ever to be reached, a reasonable per cent of Japanese total publications, not just of government publications, ought also to be exchanged. Such an enlarged exchange obviously would require heavy subsidy such as only governments could be expected to extend, so that ultimately a re-examination of the official exchange program should consider making this new request of our two governments: the Japanese government possibly being asked to supply a certain per cent of the total Japanese publishing output to several regional libraries in the United States and the American government being asked to reciprocate by supplying a similar per cent of the total American publishing output to several regional libraries in Japan.

B. Enlarged Japanese Government Publications Service Center

The present Service Center for Japanese Government Publications in Kasumigaseki has proved to be indispensable to American and Japanese scholars alike for buying Japanese Government publications currently on sale. But it would be even more useful if it could secure materials no longer current and if it could respond to mail orders from overseas. Since presumably such orders would pay for themselves, it is not immediately apparent why sales need to be limited to "cash and carry." My impression is that Japanese scholars and libraries have no difficulty in ordering any American government publications they may want directly from the Government Printing Office in Washington, but if there are any particular problems, they should be set forth and steps taken to solve them as soon as possible.

C. Hibaihin Service Center

The Japanese government is not the only publisher of "materials not for sale" in Japan. Many other Japanese materials also fall into this category, just as in America do many publications of business houses, political organizations, and the like. As already suggested, for scholars concerned with the study of contemporary society in all its ramifications, these hibaihin, whether books of poems published for self-gratification, biographies written for praising one's friends, working papers, propaganda pamphlets, or government reports, are essential for research. To the best of my knowledge, there is no systematic bibliographical control of this output and many of the materials are not collected by university libraries even in Japan. It would be enormously useful if some kind of hibaihin service center could be established here, which would attempt to compile bibliographies of these materials, locate sources of supply, and offer for a suitable fee to secure each of these materials as libraries or individual scholars may be interested in.

D. Documentation Centers

I imagine no one will deny that librarians love books--the

older, the rarer, the more substantial the binding, the better. It has been my experience that a librarian rarely objects, if he has the money, to acquiring a book by a well-known author, on good paper, put out by a reputable publishing house. But ask him to buy for his collection, save on his shelves, or catalogue in his files, such things as organ papers of trade organizations, pamphlets issued by political parties, mimeographed reports of investigatory committees or scholarly seminars, and he is apt to throw up his hands. "Ephemera," he calls them. "They're not available through the regular distribution outlets," he explains. "Not worth the cost of cataloguing," he says. "We have no adequate way to handle them." And so on. The truth is, however, that these materials, although they may not be written in graceful prose nor printed on durable material nor available through commercial channels, are what might be called society's working papers, and as such are indispensable for any study of society. The collection of such materials is a problem in every country, but I should like to illustrate what I mean by pointing out that, for example, the student of political science, whether he be American or Japanese, cannot at this moment go anywhere in either country and find a truly comprehensive collection reaching back into history, of the publications of any single political party. It is time, I submit, that librarians in our two countries began to take such problems seriously and devise imaginative new documentation centers where the working papers of society will be collected and preserved.

E. Librarian Exchange

It is a rare Japanese collection in America indeed that has an adequate staff. The difficulty, to be sure, is in part budgetary. Most universities have not yet given adequate recognition to the complexity of the problems of building and maintaining these collections and have therefore not provided adequate financial resources. Regrettably, since library expenses are both constant and increasing, philanthropic foundations and the Government have been even more reluctant to shoulder the necessary burden. But the difficulty stems also from a lack of adequately trained personnel. We have too few trained librarians in America who know the Japanese language and are familiar with Japanese scholarship. Too often, particularly in the newer libraries, we have librarians who cannot read Japanese, or Japanese staff members who are not librarians. Recently special programs have been organized by various American schools of library science to try to train the personnel needed. Another trend is for various American libraries to send representatives to Japan to try to recruit on at least a temporary basis trained librarians with experience in Japanese libraries. Although I hesitate to say since I am not a librarian myself, it would seem to me eminently useful if a project could be devised which would permit some kind of systematic interchange of library personnel between our two countries. A select number of Japanese librarians

might go to America for a year or two to work perhaps part-time in American collections of Japanese materials, helping them to get better organized and particularly helping them to clear up the backlogs of cataloguing which plague a number of them, while sharing also part-time in the work of the regular Western-language sections to improve their skills in handling such materials. Reciprocally, a select number of American librarians might come to Japan for a year or two to work perhaps part-time in Western-language collections to render whatever service they can there while sharing also part-time in the work of the regular Japanese-language sections to learn their operations. Elements of language or library instruction might be included if they were found to be desirable. Such an exchange would not immediately solve the staffing problems of American libraries, but it might go a long way toward increasing the pool of talented persons available for the very skilled work these libraries require.

F. Acquisitions Guides

We have already noted that most American collections of Japanese materials are not well-balanced. They may be strong in one field, weak in another. If the basic research libraries at the major centers of study are to be made to support serious research in each of the fields scholars are now interested in, that is, across the board in the social sciences and the humanities, advice is seriously needed as to what to acquire. What are the standard works, say, in the field of politics or of economics or of sociology, which a Japanese specialist in such fields needs to be familiar with and to have close by for reference? This is a question often put to Japanese professors or librarians who visit our collections; and many such visitors have given generously of their time and knowledge. Our own specialists, returning from periods of study in Japan, make their own recommendations. And at most centers of advanced study, faculty members, like the librarians, regularly pour over the book lists of Japanese publishers and second-hand book-stores for items of interest. But I think any objective person will have to admit that the results are spotty. We are not usually in a situation of adding new materials to collections which already include what might be thought to be the standard works published over the past many years. Many such previous works are out of print and no longer available in the market. Others, for reason of the narrowness of any specialist's attention, whether he be librarian or professor, simply have not been recognized to be sufficiently important. If Japanese specialists were willing to work with us to draw up specialized bibliographies of basic works needed in specialized research collections in each of a number of fields, these would, I should think, be immensely useful as guides for the acquisitions policies of our libraries.

I do not feel qualified to say whether Japanese scholars of western subjects feel similar lacks in their own libraries,

but my impression from visiting a number of Japanese universities with courses in one or more phases of American studies is that similar acquisitions guides in the fields of American studies prepared with the help of American professors and librarians might be useful to Japanese libraries, so that possibilities for a mutually helpful Japanese-American interchange project are present here too.

G. Duplicate Purchasing

Another device that might be explored for helping to improve the acquisitions' policies of libraries on both sides of the Pacific might be a bilateral agreement between two institutions by which in certain agreed-upon fields, each library might, when it orders books for itself, order second copies to be sent to the other library across the sea, up to whatever amounts are agreed upon and subject of course to an annual account balancing. Thus a Japanese research library of American economics or politics or history might arrange with a sister American research library knowledgeable in that field to have the American library do its buying of American books for it up to a fixed amount, by simply having the American library buy a second copy for the Japanese library every time the American library buys one for its own collection. A Japanese library buying Japanese books in certain fields in Japanese studies might reciprocate by similar duplicate buying for an American library anxious to collect in that field but not possessing the competence or confidence to make its own choices.

Are these suggestions really practical? I do not know for sure. I speak only from an American user's point of view, with inadequate knowledge of the reciprocal needs my Japanese colleagues may have in working in their English language collections here in Japan and with no knowledge at all of the librarians' profession. But if you will permit me, I should like to suggest that it would seem eminently suitable for a bi-national gathering of professionals like this to take up as a matter of some priority the devising of ways to cooperate in the improvement of Japanese language libraries in America and English language libraries in Japan.

One concrete step might be for this Conference or the sponsors of this Conference to appoint a joint Japan-United States committee, with small national panels consisting of librarians and scholars on each side, who might conduct a serious survey of the needs in each country and the kinds of cooperation that might be offered, looking toward the presentation of a report to this binational conference at its next meeting if one is planned, to each of the Governments, and to such other bodies as might be in a position to act. The new Joint Japan-US Committee for Cultural and Educational Exchanges now being organized in accord with the recommendation of the Fourth Cultural Conference held in Washington in April

1968 would certainly be interested. If such a report included an identification of priorities and a recommendation for concrete action on one or more of these priorities, that would certainly move us forward. In addition, it may be that one or more of the specific proposals I have made above, or some other proposal which may come up at this Conference, may recommend itself as so obviously desirable and so immediately practical that a special bi-national project committed could be appointed here immediately to follow up on it now. That would be even more desirable.

Conferences are judged by the beauty of their sites, the efficiency of their planning, the graciousness of the hosts, the distinction of the participants, the importance of the theme, and the interest of the discussion. In all of these points, this first bi-national library conference ranks high indeed. But conferences are also judged by whether or not they give rise to new, concrete developments of importance. If this Conference were to inaugurate a cooperative program for improving the English language libraries in Japan and the Japanese language libraries in America along some such lines as suggested here, it would be beginning a work of truly seminal character, deserving of the gratitude not only of the librarians of both countries, but of our two nations as well, for it is fundamentally on these libraries that the advancement of knowledge of each other and the improvement of understanding between our two peoples rests.

APPENDIX 8d

First Japan-U.S. Conference on Libraries and
Information Science in Higher Education

Tokyo, May 15-19, 1969

FINAL COMMUNIQUE

As the highly industrialized societies of Japan and the United States move into the post-industrial age, librarians in both countries have become increasingly concerned with the problem of how best to serve researchers and students to whom is available a bewildering array of information sources--from traditional books to the latest in teaching machines. The so-called "information explosion" of recent years, resulting in a vast outpouring of publications, documents, research reports, and other forms of recorded knowledge, has led librarians and information scientists to see new ways of storing and disseminating the flood of materials.

The First Japan-U.S. Conference on Libraries and Information Science in Higher Education, held in Tokyo on May 15-19, 1969, under the sponsorship in the United States of the American Library Association and in Japan of the Council on National University Libraries, the Public University Library Association, and the Private University Library Association, was attended by leading educators, librarians and information specialists from both countries. The conferees, representing distinguished universities and libraries in both countries, met to explore ways in which they could more effectively cooperate in developing programs of mutual benefit to education and research.

The American keynote speaker was Dr. Logan Wilson, President of the American Council on Education; his Japanese counterpart was Dr. Tatsuo Morito, President of the Japan Library Association. Dr. Morito linked student unrest in part to poor services to undergraduates, and cited as an example inadequate library facilities. Dr. Wilson wondered why more students did not "spend more time in the library freely pursuing their own intellectual interests and less time milling about on the campus demanding pedagogical reforms." He also pointed to the growing emphasis on independent student learning and the declining stress on classroom lecturing and textbook memorization, concluding that "the modern college or university library is no less important than the classroom and the laboratory as a place where learning is disseminated and advanced."

The conference attracted over 350 participants, including 23 American representatives. They heard papers prepared by both American and Japanese specialists on such topics as the

role of university libraries in higher education, the professional education of library personnel, the exchange of publications and personnel, and the application of computers to library management and information retrieval.

The conferees observed that they were meeting in a period of mounting change and unrest in education in both countries, and that fresh and innovative approaches to the instructional and learning process were sorely needed. There was agreement that because of the central importance of libraries in education, a qualitative improvement in library resources necessarily would lead to an improvement of the educational system. In the area of the automation of bibliographical controls, there was hope expressed for cooperative ventures seeking to solve common problems--for example, the handling of materials printed in a variety of scripts.

Recommendations

In its final session, the conference adopted the following recommendations:

1. The formation of appropriate Japanese and U.S. committees to provide continuity of leadership and to serve as channels of communication in the fields of library and information science between the two countries.
2. The convening of a second conference in the United States within three years.
3. The promotion of the interchange of personnel to provide opportunities for professional growth for librarians of both countries.
4. The encouragement of the use of consultants and advisers in such areas as library automation, education, and the development of area studies collections.
5. The strengthening of collections, especially in the field of government documents, by providing improved bibliographical and acquisitions services.
6. The establishment of a central clearinghouse in each country through which bibliographical information and materials could be channeled.
7. The vigorous encouragement of cooperative bibliographical programs, and the fostering of common bibliographical standards.
8. The facilitation of the exchange of professional information, including the development of comprehensive collections of materials on bibliography and librarianship in each country.

APPENDIX 9

Recommendations of the Binational Conference on
Translation of Japanese Scholarly Thought

May 6-8, 1963

A Binational Conference on Translation of Japanese Scholarly Thought met in Honolulu on May 6-8 to consider in detail Recommendation No. 6 of the Final Communique of the first United States-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange. The conferees endorsed the concept that improved and increased translation, publication and distribution of Japanese scholarly thought contributes to stronger cultural ties and understanding between Japan and the United States. (A detailed Summary Report was published by the East-West Center, University of Hawaii.)

In analyzing the general problem of transmitting Japanese thought abroad, the Japanese delegation observed that Japan has many valuable works which should be translated; that the translation of Japanese works poses many problems because of the uniqueness and peculiarities of the Japanese language; that the Japanese in translating their works have an international audience in mind; that the Japanese regard English as the international language; that there is little or no coordination of translations in Japan--that one institute or one scholar scarcely knows what the other is doing; that, in their anxiety to produce translations, Japanese translators sometimes sacrifice quality for quantity, often translating without any end use in mind; hence, they give no thought to distribution--they are satisfied when the translations are published and give the matter no further thought; that there is little or no appraisal of translations by qualified scholars, nor is appraisal sought by the translators; that in order to improve and increase translations of scholarly works in Japan, a clearinghouse to coordinate, encourage and promote translations is necessary; that the encouragement of American Japanologists is also necessary, especially in frankly appraising Japanese-executed translations and giving other advice.

There was general agreement that there is no translating profession in the United States; that the translator is usually a subject specialist associated with a university who may translate as an avocation or upon request by a publisher. There was the feeling, on the other hand, that there is very definitely a professional translator group in Japan, and that, in fact, Japan is "kind to the translator."

Although no professional translator group exists in the United States, a few of the American delegates expressed the hope that translation in the United States could be "profes-

sionalized"; that translators could be trained in certain specialized subjects; that translating could be executed "into rather than out of one's own language." There was general agreement that the principle would most certainly apply to literature but there was no agreement as to whether the translations of social science materials should adhere to this principle. There was a consensus that if Japan intends to internationalize her culture through translations, it cannot afford to encourage inferior translations.

With regard to selection, the conferees felt that in any planned program of translation of Japanese scholarly thought, there is bound to be disagreement on what should be translated. If American Japanologists are the primary objective of such a program, the responsibility of deciding what is desirable should be assigned to the Americans. The Americans should indicate what works in which field should be translated. On the other hand, the Japanese wish to promote translations to internationalize their culture. Hence, the works they select and give priority to may not necessarily coincide with the works selected by the Americans. In any event, what the Japanese deemed important for early translation may not be so regarded by the Americans. It was hoped that the recommended clearinghouse could in the future coordinate the wishes of the Americans with those of the Japanese. One point of view was that the culture which did the translating should have the prior say on what is to be translated. An opposing view was that the scholarly needs of Americans should have the prior consideration and, hence, the culture into which the translations were being done should assume the responsibility of selection.

It was also suggested that the delegations were interpreting the word "scholarly" too literally; that the drafters of Resolution 6 did not have such a narrow interpretation in mind.

There was general agreement that the most frequently used reference works should be translated and made available. There was no achievable consensus on the value and importance of translating dictionaries. Since more collaborative efforts between the Japanese and Americans are desirable, a division of labor was proposed in the matter of translations. One specific proposal was that the Japanese be given the responsibility of translating and the Americans that of distribution. Another was that the first draft of translations be done in Japan, but with the assistance of an American expert, presumably living in Japan. It was felt in this instance that since the reference materials, as well as the Japanese scholars who originally wrote the manuscripts, are in Japan, the logical place in which to do the translations was Japan. Another position was that translations done into one's own language, especially in literature and in the humanities, would undoubtedly produce better results, but there is admittedly a dearth of

qualified translators in the United States, and often the qualified translators are too busy with their academic duties to give much time to translating.

Due to the great number of academic societies and scholarly journals in existence in Japan, it was felt by the conferees that the responsibility of compiling annotated bibliographies should be that of the Japanese. The clearinghouse was again mentioned as the most logical agency to resolve this problem.

Several delegates felt that they would like to see the Japanese assume the major responsibility of providing translators if the translation could be checked or monitored by Americans. But this raised the problem of where to find the requisite number of qualified check-editors and monitors. Qualified Americans are as a rule college professors who are preoccupied with teaching and research, or, as someone claimed, too well paid to engage in check-editing someone else's work.

It was proposed that a registry of translators by specialized fields be compiled in Japan by the clearinghouse. Although there are professional translators in Japan, it is becoming increasingly difficult to find qualified ones for these purposes because of the highly specialized nature of scholarly materials. The clearinghouse could also compile a list of American specialists temporarily domiciled in Japan who could monitor the translations.

Some Americans were inclined to place evaluation after translation and before publication and distribution. In any event, the whole process implies binational efforts. Selection would be binational; translation, if ideally done, would have American collaboration or at least American editing and advice; publication would, in most instances, be done in Japan, but distribution would be handled in the United States, for example, by the East-West Center Press; evaluation would be largely the contribution of Americans.

SUMMARY RECOMMENDATIONS

In summary, the conferees:

1. Endorsed and gave full encouragement to the proposed establishment in Tokyo of a clearinghouse for international exchange of Japanese scholarly thought.
2. Recommended that, pending any measures which the Second United States-Japan Cultural Conference may recommend to bring about increased cooperation and collaboration between the two countries in matters pertaining to translation, the

Japan Society of New York and the East-West Center serve as liaison between a clearinghouse in Tokyo and academic and cultural societies, other private and governmental organizations, and individual scholars in the United States interested in the translation of Japanese scholarly thought.

3. Recommended that the Japan Society and the East-West Center, as a practical, initial, step toward closer relations with the clearinghouse in Tokyo, compile and forward to the latter (1) a mailing list of American scholars and institutions interested in the translation of Japanese scholarly thought and (2) a list of American Japanologists willing to assist the Japanese in appraising and evaluating translations done in Japan.

4. Recommended the encouragement of cooperative and collaborative efforts between the two countries in all the steps involved in the translation of Japanese scholarly thought--from its selection, translation and publication to its evaluation and distribution--through the coordination provided by the clearinghouse in Tokyo and the East-West Center and the Japan Society in the United States.

5. Suggested that although not listed in any order of preference, the translation of Japanese scholarly thought should concentrate initially on the following kinds of works or documents:

- a. dictionaries such as the *Kojien*;
- b. specialized dictionaries and references in history, international relations and Buddhism;
- c. yearbooks, such as the *Asahi Nenkan*;
- d. government documents, such as the Foreign Office Bluebook and the White Papers of other ministries;
- e. directories of scholars and research institutes;
- f. works in the humanities, including philosophy, religion, and literature;
- g. annotated bibliographies and abstracts of scholarly works.

6. Suggested that the possibility of having translations of Japanese scholarly thought accepted for publication in American journals specializing in economics, political science, and other fields of study should be explored.

7. Suggested that the expression "scholarly thought" be given a broader interpretation to include cultural and contemporary writings of general interest to intellectuals and, ac-

cordingly, to explore the possibility of having translations of such writings included in American newspapers and magazines.

8. Agreed that every effort should be made to have existing translations media, such as the U.S. Embassy Translations, the Japan Report and the Asia Foundation Booknotes, include more translations, or notices of translations, of Japanese scholarly thought.

9: ANNEX A

Participants

Hideo Kishimoto, Librarian, Tokyo University
 Isao Amagi, Director of Research, Ministry of Education
 Kazuo Enoki, Deputy Director, Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies
 Ichiro Suzuki, Chief, Division of Research and Field Operations, KBS
 Wm. Theodore de Bary, Columbia University
 John M. Maki, University of Washington
 James W. Morley, Columbia University
 Harry Oshima, University of Hawaii
 Douglas W. Overton, Japan Society
 Donald L. Ranard, Department of State
 Edward Seidensticker, Stanford University
 Osamu Shimizu, Library of Congress
 Minoru Shinoda, East-West Center
 Joseph K. Yamagiwa, University of Michigan

APPENDIX 10a

Background on the Fourth United States-Japan Conference
on Educational and Cultural Interchange

The United States-Japan Conferences on Educational and Cultural Exchange stem from the meeting in Washington in June, 1961, of President Kennedy and Prime Minister Ikeda, who gave recognition to a general desire to reinforce the already well-developed state of partnership and cooperation between the United States and Japan at certain basic and critical points.

In their joint communique issued on June 22, 1961, the President and the Prime Minister "agreed to establish a joint United States-Japan committee on trade and economic affairs at the cabinet level," and two other bodies, "one to study expanded cultural and educational cooperation between the two countries, and the other to seek ways to strengthen scientific cooperation."

The economic and the science committees met in the fall and early winter of 1961; the Joint United States-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange was held January 25 through 31, 1962. In an exchange of Notes Verbales in the fall of 1961, the American Embassy (in Tokyo) and the Japanese Ministry established terms of reference for the First Conference. The Conference was:

- (1) to be established pursuant to the terms of the Communique of June 22, 1961;
- (2) to survey and evaluate the entire field of educational and cultural relations between Japan and the United States, both private and governmental, during the post-war period;
- (3) to identify areas for greater future emphasis and make recommendations as to methods of increasing intellectual interchange and strengthening cooperation between the two countries in educational and cultural fields;
- (4) to make proposals for the implementation of these recommendations.

The first days the conference discussed in broad terms the exchange of persons, exchange of materials, exchanges in the arts, Japanese studies in the U.S., American studies in Japan; Language Teaching; and Institutional Relationships (sister-city affiliations, university-to-university exchanges, etc.).

Out of the conference papers and final communique came a series of broad long-range recommendations as well as a body

of specific needs, goals, and projects that could gainfully be pursued either by the governments, private resources or both. The closing communique called for holding a second meeting in the U.S. in 1963 to review progress and plan for the future.

The Second Conference concerned itself with four major subjects: (1) educational and cultural television; (2) translation and abstracts; (3) American and Japanese studies, and (4) the performing arts. In the case of the first three, the creation of some facilitative instrument or body (such as a clearinghouse or institute) was recommended in the conference's final communique. Considerable progress has been made in establishing clearinghouses for educational TV, and the American Studies Foundation is serving in part as the instrumentality recommended in connection with American studies, but the clearinghouse for translations-abstracts has never been inaugurated.

In the meetings held between the second and third conferences, the American Embassy and the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs agreed that the first two conferences attempted to deal with too many subjects and fields; that henceforth the conferences would be well advised to limit themselves to one subject at a time, or at most two; that the topics discussed be approached as seminar discussions, covering both the broader aspects of problems and the specific details thereof. Accordingly, the governments considered an agenda that would fit into the general subject: The Role of the University in Mutual Understanding Between Japan and the United States. This agenda encompassed binational approaches to cross-cultural education, including: joint research on curriculum development, reciprocal area studies programs, educational planning for industrial societies at the university level, the campus community and binational understanding; developing bilateral faculty and material resources, including retraining of area specialists abroad, coordinated university-to-university exchanges, language teacher exchanges, binational exchange of scholarly materials; and the foreign student and mutual understanding, including the foreign student as language and cultural informant, standardization of foreign student selection procedures, equalization of student credits, predeparture orientation and counseling, and university-sponsored foreign study programs.

Among other things, the conferees at the third conference suggested or recommended:

- (1) That Fulbright appointments in certain fields be for longer terms and in some cases should be repeated in later years;
- (2) That counseling procedures be extended and reinforced by the establishment of counseling and guidance centers in the United States and Japan;

- (3) That the possibilities of securing lower rates of air travel for approved exchange students from both countries be explored;
- (4) That the recommendations of earlier conferences which called for the establishment of a clearinghouse for translations and a "massive effort" to solve the problems of the language barrier be implemented;
- (5) That the library systems of both countries would benefit through a program of exchanges of library personnel and mutual help in their training;
- (6) That orientation programs be developed as a continuing process, relating the programs given the student at home to those provided abroad and that admissions officers and foreign student advisors be used in the orientation programs conducted abroad;
- (7) That a Japanese team be sent to the United States to evaluate contemporary Japanese studies in America.

In the course of the Conference many suggestions for constructive actions were made by delegates and observers. The following are examples and are commended to appropriate public or private agencies for further study.

- (1) The development of joint research projects in such fields as urbanization; history of the Pacific area; international organizations; child development; theories of learning; and economic development.
- (2) Cooperation by Japan and the United States in helping UNESCO to work more effectively with universities in achieving its goals of international understanding.
- (3) Exchange of experience with regard to university administration and financial support, including relation to the tax system.
- (4) Exchange of experience and of concepts of general education in our two university systems.
- (5) Cooperative study of third cultures, for example European and Asian studies.
- (6) Sending a Japanese team to examine and evaluate contemporary Japanese studies in America.
- (7) Utilization of responsible representatives of American universities in the orientation programs given to Japanese students prior to their departure for the United States. The use of admissions officers and Foreign Student Advisors is particularly recommended.

In the final communique, the "Japanese delegates expressed the hope that the Japanese government in the future will share in the financial support of these two programs in view of their benefits to Japan. Such joint support would contribute to their long-term continuation and development. The American delegation endorsed this suggestion." The final communique also called for the establishment of Sister Japanese and American committees.

APPENDIX 10b

Fourth United States-Japan Conference on
Cultural and Educational Interchange

FINAL COMMUNIQUE

Six years after the first United States-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange met in Tokyo and nearly seven years after this series of binational discussions was brought into being by the decision of Prime Minister Ikeda and President Kennedy, the Fourth Conference convened in Washington, D.C., from April 3 to 8, 1968. General discussion of cultural problems in the first two Conferences had led to a more specific concentration on the role of universities in mutual understanding at the Third Conference, making it appropriate to devote the fourth meeting to the broader educational systems of the two countries. The subject was made particularly significant by the fact that Japan and the United States share world leadership in mass education and so have come to confront similar problems. Discussion at the Fourth Conference benefitted greatly from the atmosphere of cordiality which has developed in the course of previous Cultural Conferences.

I. EDUCATION AND DEVELOPMENT IN ADVANCED SOCIETIES

Recognizing that accelerated industrialization and modernization impose an unprecedented rate of change in the educational systems of advanced societies, the Conference examined the economic, structural, and philosophical features which currently characterize the Japanese and American systems.

The delegates noted similarities in their educational systems as well as differences which reflect the environment and historical individuality of each nation. In both countries education has become a major industry, calling for evaluation of its position within the total economy. In both countries the administrative and financial role of government has become increasingly important, necessitating a reconsideration of the relationship of government to education. Among the problems common to both, the delegates identified the rising enrollments and increased demands for education; the difficulties of keeping educational research, technology and philosophy abreast of the needs of a rapidly changing modern society; the relationship of education to the surpluses and shortages of human resources created by the changing needs of a modern society. Both countries share the problem of providing adequate support for private educational institutions. In contrast, both countries have, for example, approached the problem of democratiz-

ing education in different ways. The heterogeneity of the United States and the homogeneity of Japan, as well as the diversity of their cultural heritages, lead to different approaches and different solutions.

Other differences were identified, for example, the degree of emphasis placed on primary and secondary education as against higher education. There was general consensus, however, that study of these and other differences is fruitful and that each country can benefit from closer examination of the other's system.

Accordingly the Conference recommended as a priority activity for the near future a program of: (1) exchange of information on the educational systems at all levels; (2) increased exchanges of educational administrators and teachers; (3) joint binational research projects on comparative education, educational planning and technology, and studies including third countries; and (4) sharing the experience of Japan and the United States in the educational development of other nations.

II. GENERAL REVIEW

The Conference turned then to a general review of the current status and a consideration of possible new emphases in the cultural and educational interchange between Japan and the United States. In view of the ever increasing importance of Japan and the United States to each other, and of the central value of cultural and educational interchange to the advancement of learning, the enrichment of life, and the deepening of understanding between the two countries, the Conference noted with deep satisfaction the continued growth in the number of students, scholars, and artists crossing the Pacific. It also noted with satisfaction that research projects have recently been undertaken with financial support from both governments and under the joint auspices of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies in the United States and the Society for the Promotion of Science in Japan.

At the same time, it pointed out that this interchange had not yet reached a level commensurate with its importance. The flow, it was felt, has been too one-sided. Effort should be made to bring more Americans to Japan and to have Japanese scholarship and cultural experience better understood in America. Lack of financial support was recognized to be a major factor inhibiting balanced and adequate interchange. Additional funds need to be sought on both sides if the relationship is to be sustained and expanded as both desire. The Conference also called attention to the still existent barriers to understanding created by the differences in language and

cultural background of the two countries. And it was pointed out especially that a joint effort is needed to study and reduce these underlying intellectual barriers deriving from differences in cultural heritage.

III. ESTABLISHMENT OF A PERMANENT JOINT COMMITTEE

In line with the requirements of the adopted agenda, an overall review and evaluation of the current status of United States-Japan educational and cultural relations was conducted. The conferees concluded that the dimensions of mutual interests and common problems in the educational and cultural life of the two countries require constant discussion in depth by distinguished Japanese and American leaders. The experience of this and the preceding three conferences since 1962 and the growing importance of these relations in modern societies underline the need to continue these biennial conferences and to provide a more permanent basis for the work of the Conferences.

Accordingly, the Conference resolved that a Permanent Joint Committee be established to replace the temporary sister committees and working groups created by the Third Conference. Such a committee, it was felt, could provide greater continuity to the work of coordinating the broad and varied range of cultural and educational activities, and could serve as a primary planning agency for the biennial Conferences.

The Conference adopted the following resolution:

Resolution Adopted by the Fourth United States-
Japan Conference on Cultural and
Educational Interchange

April 8, 1968

WHEREAS

the delegates to the Fourth United States-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange, meeting at Washington, D.C., April 3-8, 1968, recognize the substantial progress achieved by earlier Conferences through bilateral consideration and open discussion of common problems affecting the educational and cultural relations of Japan and the United States,

AND WHEREAS

the delegates consider that the diversified nature and scope of educational and cultural relations between the two countries demand periodic review and evaluation, continuing support and encouragement, and more constant and consistent initiatives,

AND WHEREAS

both countries have joint responsibilities for ensuring that the channels of artistic and intellectual communication continue to be developed and fully utilized,

AND WHEREAS

binational solutions must be found for the still existent barriers to free interchange in the arts and scholarship,

BE IT HEREBY RESOLVED

that this Conference recommend to the Prime Minister of Japan and to the President of the United States that the two Governments continue to convene these Conferences biennially, alternating their sites between the two countries, and that a single Permanent Joint Committee on United States-Japan Cultural and Educational Cooperation be appointed, replacing the separate sister committees and working groups created by the preceding Conference;

AND BE IT RECOMMENDED

that the Permanent Joint Committee on United States-Japan Cultural and Educational Cooperation (a) follow up on recommendations made at previous conferences; (b) constantly review activities affecting the cultural and educational relations between the two countries; (c) explore and recommend new initiatives and new fields of activity referred to in (b) above; and (d) submit plans for succeeding Conferences;

AND BE IT FURTHER RECOMMENDED

that the co-chairmen of this Conference hereby appoint an ad hoc working group from both countries to draw up specific recommendations on the size, composition, mode of operation, staffing and other requirements of the Permanent Committee, to be submitted to both governments for consideration. (End of Resolution.)

IV. SPECIFIC NEEDS

Certain specific needs were singled out for priority consideration by the Permanent Joint Committee whose establishment was recommended. These included the following:

In the interchange of students, teachers, and researchers generally, the need to strengthen the role of the social sciences, the humanities, and the arts;

In the social sciences, the need to encourage more joint research activities of the kinds that have been so fruitful in the natural sciences;

In the Fulbright Program, the desirability of finding additional new resources to enable it to continue its present individual grant program and, if possible, to expand its activities to support joint research projects, binational seminars and conferences, and to perform for a larger body of students and scholars such facilitative services as counselling, orientation, language testing and the like;

In the field of library development and the exchange of published materials, the desirability in each country to work toward the establishment of one or more comprehensive libraries of materials published in the other country, to enrich a number of smaller collections primarily for undergraduate study, to establish an effective clearinghouse to assist libraries in both countries with bibliographical information and with acquisitions problems, particularly of official publications and other materials not available in regular commercial channels, to advance cooperative cataloging, to exchange library consultants and in-service trainees;

In English-language teaching for Japanese, recognized by every Cultural Conference as a matter of highest concern, the need to keep under constant review the many serious efforts now being made;

In Japanese-language teaching for Americans, the need to recruit a greater number of able instructors, to devise teaching materials particularly for advanced work in specialized fields, and to improve and expand the facilities in Japan for instruction;

In translation and abstracting, the need to locate or train a greater number of competent translators, particularly in the social sciences, to find greater financial support for translation, and to work together to identify works worthy of translation;

In the arts, the need to heighten the appreciation and increase the possibility for enjoyment of the traditional and contemporary arts of both countries.

SUPPLEMENT

Roster of Scholars in Japanese Studies
in the United States

Roster of Scholars of Japanese Studies
in the United States

The Roster of Scholars is composed of those individuals whose teaching and research is primarily concerned with some aspect of the field of Japanese studies. In the course of compiling the roster, certain limitations and criteria had to be established. First, the roster was limited to active members of the academic world in the United States who are competent in the Japanese language. Hence, lawyers, journalists, and government personnel have been excluded, with the exception of a few individuals whose research and writing constitutes a significant contribution to the field. Likewise, it was impossible to include those whose primary connection with the field is "interest"; nor was it felt that simply "teaching about Japan" was sufficient justification for inclusion. Next, a most difficult problem was presented by the native speaking language teacher. The importance of the role of the native speaker in training linguistically competent scholars deserves full recognition. Yet many of these teachers are only in the United States for a few years, and together constitute a highly fluid group. The problem was partially resolved by the decision to include those native speaking language teachers who have academic rank and an advanced degree (either M.A. or Ph.D.), or who are known to be engaged in research and writing. Finally, every effort was made to compile as complete and up-to-date a roster as possible. However, information about recent recipients of the Ph.D. degree or Ph.D. candidates who are presently teaching was extremely hard to obtain. We regret any omissions that may have occurred.

The information which is given for each individual includes present position (as of September, 1970); the year, institution and topic of the most advanced degree received; and current research interests. This information was obtained from a number of sources: returned questionnaires, American Men of Science, Directory of American Scholars, Japan and Korea: An Annotated Bibliography of Doctoral Dissertations, and recent college and university catalogues. The symbol (nJ) following information about the Ph.D. indicates that the dissertation was either not concerned or was only tangentially concerned with Japan.

Roster of Scholars

ABE, YOSHIYA
Inst., Dept. of Hist.
Wisconsin State University
Ph.D. cand. Claremont, "Religious Freedom under the Meiji Constitution"

ABOSCH, DAVID
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
State University of New York, Buffalo
Ph.D. 1964 Berkeley, Meiji intellectual hist.
Meiji intellectual hist.

ADRIAANZ, WILLIAM T.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Music
University of Washington
Ph.D. 1965 UCLA, Koto music

AKASHI, YOJI
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Geneva College
Ph.D. 1963 Georgetown, anti-Japanese movements in China, 1908-1941
foreign policy 1941-1945

AKITA, GEORGE
Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1960 Harvard, Meiji political hist.
study of Diet members 1890-1960

AMIOKA, SHIRO
Prof., Dept. of Educ.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1959 Indiana, philosophy of educ. (nJ)
hist. of educ.

ANDERSON, RONALD S.
Prof., Dept. of Educ.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1956 Berkeley, Buddhist nationalism
hist. of educ., modern

ANTHONY, DAVID F.
Prof., Dept. of Asian Studies
Randolph-Macon Women's College; Visiting Prof., Dept. of Hist. University of Virginia
Ph.D. 1951 Yale, Meiji local hist.
role of the university in society

AOKI, HARUO
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Oriental Lang.
University of California, Berkeley
Ph.D. 1965 California, ling. (nJ)
Japanese dialectology

ARAKI, JAMES T.
Prof., Dept. of Asian and Pacific Lang.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1961 Berkeley, Kowakamai Kawabata; 18th C. prose fiction

ASHIKAGA, E.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Oriental Lang.
University of California, Los Angeles

AUSTIN, LEWIS
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Pol.
Sci.
Yale University
Ph.D. cand. M.I.T., "Groups
and their Leadership in
the Japanese Administra-
tive Elite..."

AZUMI, KOYA
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Soci.
University of Wisconsin
Ph.D. 1966 Columbia, re-
cruitment by big firms
social movement; large or-
ganizations

BAERWALD, HANS
Prof., Dept. of Pol. Sci.
University of California,
Los Angeles
Ph.D. 1956 Berkeley, occupa-
tion purge
contemporary foreign policy

BAILEY, DON C.
Prof., Dept. of Oriental
Studies
University of Arizona
Ph.D. 1960 Michigan, early
lexicography
dictionary of proper nouns
and technical terms

BAILEY, JACKSON H.
Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Earlham College.
Ph.D. 1959 Harvard, Prince
Saionji
collection of readings on
contemporary Japan, and on
modern Japanese hist.

BALDINGER, WALLACE S.
Director, Museum of Art
Prof., Dept. of Art Hist.
University of Oregon
Ph.D. 1938 Chicago, art
hist. (nJ)
Maruyama-Shijō and Kanō schools,
Rakuchū-rakugai byōbu

BATTISTINI, LAWRENCE H.
Prof. Dept. of Social Science
Michigan State University
Ph.D. 1947 Yale
foreign relations, postwar
problems

BEARDSLEY, RICHARD K.
Prof., Dept. of Anth.
University of Michigan
Ph.D. 1947 Berkeley, archaeol-
ogy (nJ)
industrial impact on rural
communities;
annotated bibliography of
Japanese materials in
social anth. and soci.

BECKMANN, GEORGE M.
Director, Far Eastern and
Russian Institute
University of Washington
Ph.D. 1951 Stanford, Meiji
constitutional hist.
anarcho-syndicalism; modern
polit. development

BEER, LAWRENCE W.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Pol.
Sci.
University of Colorado
Ph.D. 1966 Washington (Seat-
tle), Constitutional doc-
trine: freedom of assembly
comparative polit. systems,
Far East
Supreme Court cases

BEFU, BEN
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Orien-
tal Lang.
University of California, Los
Angeles
Ph.D. 1966 Stanford, Saikaku
translation

BEFU, HARUMI
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Anth.
Stanford University
Ph.D. 1959 Wisconsin, rural
communities
human relations: institu-
tional and motivational
factors

BELLAH, ROBERT N.
Prof., Dept. of Socio.
Chairman, Center for Japa-
nese and Korean Studies
University of California,
Berkeley
Ph.D. 1955 Harvard, Tokugawa
religion
values and social change

BENNETT, JOHN W.
Prof., Dept. of Anth.
Washington University (St.
Louis)
Ph.D. 1946 Chicago, rural
econ. and social organi-
zation
social change and econ.
growth

BERGER, GORDON M.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of Southern Cali-
fornia
Ph.D. cand. Yale, "The
Search for a New Political
Order and the Imperial
Rule Assistance Associa-
tion in Japan, 1932-1945"

BERNSTEIN, GAIL L.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of Arizona
Ph.D. 1968 Harvard, Taisho
intellectual hist.
Kawakami Hajime; Marxism

BERTON, PETER A.
Assoc. Prof., School of I.R.
University of Southern Cali-
fornia
Ph.D. 1956 Columbia, Sino-
Japanese relations ca. 1916
foreign and military policy

BIKLE, GEORGE B., JR.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of California,
Riverside
Ph.D. 1968 Berkeley, utopianism
modern utopian social movements

BLOOM, ALFRED
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Relig.
University of Oregon
Ph.D. 1963 Harvard, Shinran
Buddhism

BOBILIN, ROBERT T.
Sr. Specialist, Relig. and
Soci., Institute for Ad-
vanced Projects
East-West Center, University
of Hawaii
Nichiren Buddhism and social
change

BOCK, FELICIA
Asst. Prof.
University of California,
Berkeley
Ph.D. 1966 Berkeley, early re-
ligion and social customs
Engi-shiki ceremonial

BORTON, HUGH
Sr. Lecturer and Research
Associate
Columbia University
Ph.D. 1937 Leyden, Tokugawa
hist.
20th C. hist.

BOWLES, GORDON T.
Prof., Dept. of Anth.
Syracuse University
Ph.D. Harvard 1935
human ecology

BRAISTED, WILLIAM R.
Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of Texas, Austin
Ph.D. 1950 Chicago, U.S. Far
Eastern naval hist.
translation of Meiroke
zasshi

BRAZELL, KAREN W.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of East
Asian Studies
Princeton University
Ph.D. 1969 Columbia,
Towazugatari
Mori Oga; Towazugatari

BRETT, CECIL C.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Pol.
Sci.
Director, East Asian Studies
Program
Monmouth College
Ph.D. 1956 Michigan, local
government
local government: Okayama

BRITSCH, R. LANIER
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Brigham Young University
Ph.D. 1968 Claremont, mis-
sionary hist. (nJ) .

BRONFENBENNER, MARTIN
Prof., Dept. of Econ.
Carnegie-Mellon University
Ph.D. 1939 Chicago, econ.
(nJ)
contemporary economic prob-
lems

BROWER, ROBERT H.
Prof., Dept. of FEL
University of Michigan
Ph.D. 1952 Michigan, Konjaku
monogatari
classical poetry and criticism

BROWN, DELMAR M.
Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of California,
Berkeley
Ph.D. 1946 Stanford, medieval
econ.
gukansho; early relig. and
society

BROWN, L. KEITH
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Anth.
University of Pittsburgh
Ph.D. 1964 Chicago, rural
social anth.
family and kinship adaptations
to urban environment

BROWN, SIDNEY deV.
Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Oklahoma State University
Ph.D. 1952 Wisconsin, Meiji
polit. hist.
Kido Takayoshi

BRUDNOY, DAVID
Lect., Dept. of Hist.
Northeastern University
Ph.D. cand. Brandeis, hist.
(nJ)

BUCK, JAMES H.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of Georgia
Ph.D. 1959 American, Satsuma
rebellion
Satsuma rebellion; kokuji

BURKE, WILLIAM M.
Sr. Economist
Federal Reserve Bank, San
Francisco
Ph.D. 1958 Georgetown, en-
trepreneur in econ. devel.
econ. devel.

BURKS, ARDATH W.
Prof., Dept. of Pol. Sci.
Rutgers University
Ph.D. 1949 Johns Hopkins,
econ. thought
educational exchange, Meiji;
study of city of Tokyo

BUTLER, KENNETH
Director,
Inter-University Center for
Japanese Studies, Tokyo
Ph.D. 1964 Harvard, Heike
monogatari
Heike monogatari texts; oral
tales

BUTOW, ROBERT
Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of Washington
Ph.D. 1953 Stanford, polit.
hist.
translation of Kido diaries

CAUDILL, WILLIAM A.
Chief, Section on Personali-
ty and Environment, Labo-
ratory of Socio-Environ-
mental Studies
National Institute of Mental
Health
Ph.D. 1950 Chicago, social
anth.
comparative psychiatric case
studies Japan-Taiwan; com-
parative study Japanese
and American children

CHAMBLISS, WILLIAM J.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of Kentucky
Ph.D. 1963 Michigan, local
econ. hist.
late Tokugawa criminal proce-
dure; handbook of Tokugawa
terminology

CHANG, KENNE H-K.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Anth.
University of California, Davis
Ph.D. 1968 Stanford, rural
cultural ecology
fishing ecology of Iki Island

CHANG, RICHARD T.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of Florida
Ph.D. 1964 Michigan, Sakuma
Shozan and Fujita Toko
Meiji statesmen; treaty revi-
sions

CHAPLIN, HAMAKO I.
Lect., Dept. of East and
South Asian Lang.
Yale University
B.A. Jissen Women's College
morphophonemics of adjectives

CH'EN, HSIEN T'ING
Res. Fellow, East Asian Studies
Harvard University
Ph.D. 1963 Harvard, military
hist.
transformation of the State
1868-1889

CHIANG, WEN-HSIEN
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Arizona State University
Ph.D. 1969 Pennsylvania, ex-
pansion into China 1931-1936

CLUBOK, ALFRED
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Pol.
 Sci.
 University of Florida
 Ph.D. 1962 Michigan, local
 electoral politics: Okayama

CODY, CECIL
 Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 State University College of
 New York, Oswego
 Ph.D. 1955 Washington (Seat-
 tle), Itagaki Taisuke
 Itagaki Taisuke; Japanese in
 Davao

COHEN, JEROME B.
 Prof., Dept. of Econ.
 City University of New York,
 Baruch
 Ph.D. 1949 Columbia, wartime
 econ.
 trade with Communist China

COLE, ALLAN B.
 Prof., Dept. of East Asian
 Affairs
 Fletcher School
 Ph.D. 1940 Chicago, American
 expansion toward Japan

COLE, ROBERT
 Dept. of Soci.
 University of Michigan
 Ph.D. 1968 Illinois, blue
 collar workers: observa-
 tions

COLEMAN, REX
 Res. Associate in Japanese
 law
 Harvard Law School
 M. Jur. 1960 University of
 Tokyo, private internation-
 al law
 taxation

COLTON, HATTIE
 Chairman, East Asian Area
 Studies
 Foreign Service Institute
 Dept. of State

COLTON, KENNETH E.
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Pol.
 Sci.
 Kent State University
 M.A. 1942 Iowa

COMITINI, SALVATORE
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Econ.
 University of Hawaii
 Ph.D. 1960 Washington (Seat-
 tle), econ. devel. of fish-
 eries
 econ. devel. and resources

CONROY, F. HILARY
 Prof. Dept. of Hist.
 University of Pennsylvania
 Ph.D. 1949 Berkeley, immigra-
 tion to Hawaii
 emigration

COOX, ALVIN D.
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 San Diego State College
 Ph.D. 1951 Harvard

COPELAND, EDWARD M.
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of FEL
 University of Minnesota
 Ph.D.

CORNILL, JOHN B.
 Prof., Dept. of Anth.
 University of Texas, Austin
 Ph.D. 1953 Michigan, a mountain
 community
 emigration, acculturation and
 assimilation

CRAIG, ALBERT M.
 Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Harvard University
 Ph.D. 1959 Harvard, Choshu in
 the Meiji Restoration
 the Meiji State

CRANSTON, EDWIN A.
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of FEL
 Harvard University
 Ph.D. 1966 Stanford, Izumi
 Shikibu diary
 Man'yōshū, Izumi Shikibu

CROWLEY, JAMES B.
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Yale University
 Ph.D. 1959 Michigan, foreign
 policy 1931-1938
 foreign policy 1914-1919;
 1937-1941

CURTIS, GERALD
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Pol.
 Sci.
 Columbia University
 Ph.D. 1969 Columbia, LDP
 campaign strategy

DATOR, JAMES A.
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Pol.
 Sci.
 University of Hawaii
 Ph.D. 1959 American, pol.
 sci. (nJ)
 technology, value change and
 polit. systems

FEARBY, WILLIAM THEODORE
 Prof., Dept. of Oriental
 Studies
 Columbia University
 Ph.D. 1953 Columbia, hist.
 (nJ)
 17th C. neo-Confucian thought

DEVOS, GEORGE A.
 Prof., Dept. of Anth.
 University of California,
 Berkeley
 Ph.D. 1951 Chicago, psych. (nJ)
 social problems

DIGENNARO, HIDEKO Y.
 Inst., Dept. of FEL
 New York University
 M.A. Teachers' College, Colum-
 bia
 computer assisted language
 teaching

DILWORTH, DAVID
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Phil.
 Manhattanville College
 Visiting Asst. Prof., Dept.
 of FEL
 Columbia University
 Ph.D. 1963 Fordham, phil. (nJ)
 Ph.D. 1963 Columbia, Nishida
 Kitarō
 translation of Nishida Kitarō

DINGMAN, ROGER
 Lect., Dept. of Hist.
 Harvard University
 Ph.D. cand. Harvard, "Power in
 the Pacific: The Evolution
 of Japanese and American
 Naval Policies 1918-1921"

DONOGHUE, JOHN D.
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Anth.
 Michigan State University
 Ph.D. 1956 Chicago, outcaste
 groups
 community development; social
 change

DOWER, JOHN
 Inst., Dept. of Hist.
 University of Nebraska
 Ph.D. cand. Harvard

DULL, PAUL S.
 Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 University of Oregon
 Ph.D. 1940 Washington
 (Seattle)
 polit. behavior

DUUS, PETER
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Claremont
 Ph.D. 1965 Harvard, Taisho
 polit. hist.
 modern polit. thought; post
 1890 social hist.; Yoshino
 Sakuzo

EARHART, H. BYRON
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Relig.
 Western Michigan University
 Ph.D. 1965 Chicago, Mt.
 Haguro school shūgendō
 new religious movements

EARL, DAVID M.
 Dept. of Hist.
 Eastern Michigan University
 Ph.D. 1957 Columbia, late
 Tokugawa polit. values

ELISON, GEORGE S.
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 and Govt.
 Colby College
 Ph.D. 1969 Harvard, Christi-
 anity in early modern
 Japan; Meiji Restoration

ELSBREE, WILLARD H.
 Prof., Dept. of Govt.
 Ohio University
 Ph.D. 1952 Harvard, wartime
 relations with Southeast
 Asia
 postwar relation with South-
 east Asia

EMMERSON, JOHN
 Scholar in Residence, Dept. of
 Pol. Sci.
 Stanford University
 M.A. 1930 New York University,
 pol. sci. (nJ)
 U.S.-Japan relations; security

EPP, ROBERT
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Oriental
 Lang.
 University of California, Los
 Angeles
 Ph.D. 1964 Harvard, Meiji
 legal hist.

EVANS, ROBERT, JR.
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Econ.
 Brandeis University
 Ph.D. 1959 Chicago, econ. (nJ)
 industrial relations; compara-
 tive Japan-U.S. labor econ.

EYRE, JOHN D.
 Prof., Dept. of Geog.
 University of North Carolina
 Ph.D. 1951 Michigan, salt pro-
 duction and trade
 metropolitan areas; population
 and econ. concentration

FAHS, CHARLES B.
 Director, International Pro-
 grams
 Prof., Dept. of Pol. Sci.
 Miami University (Ohio)
 Ph.D. 1933 Northwestern, House
 of Peers

FALCONERI, G. RALPH
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 University of Oregon
 Ph.D. 1966 Michigan, policy
 toward Chinese nationalist
 revolution
 early Showa domestic politics

FARNSWORTH, LEE
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Pol.
 Sci.
 Brigham Young University
 Ph.D. 1963 Claremont, fac-
 tionalism
 polit. bosses; Sino-Japanese
 relations

FRAGER, ROBERT
 Visiting Lect., Dept. of
 Psych.
 University of California,
 Berkeley
 Ph.D. 1967 Harvard, conform-
 ity
 non-verbal communication;
 cognitive and personality
 effects of meditation

FRENCH, CALVIN
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Art
 Hist.
 University of Michigan
 Ph.D. 1966 Columbia, Shiba
 Kōkan
 Western influence on Japanese
 art

FRIDELL, WILBUR M.
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Relig.
 Studies
 University of California,
 Santa Barbara
 Ph.D. 1966 Berkeley, govt.
 policy toward Shinto
 shrines during Meiji
 Meiji govt. actions toward
 shrines
 prewar govt. school textbooks

FROST, PETER
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Williams College
 Ph.D. 1966 Harvard, Tokugawa
 monetary system
 Bakumatsu currency crisis;
 university problems

FUJIKAWA, ASAKO
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Asian
 and Pacific Lang.
 University of Hawaii
 M.A. 1956 Columbia
 M.A. 1960 Ryukoku

FUJIKAWA, FUMIKO
 Inst., Japanese Lang.
 Manhattanville College
 Ph.D. cand. Columbia, "A Study
 of the Dates of Authorship
 of a 10th Century Tale of
 Japan: The Tale of the Hollow"

FUJIOKA, NORITO
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Asian
 and Pacific Lang.
 University of Hawaii
 M.A. 1952 Hawaii, translation
 of study on phonology
 reference grammar of modern
 spoken Japanese

FUKUI, HARUHIRO
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Pol. Sci.
 University of California,
 Santa Barbara
 Ph.D. 1968 Australian National
 University, LDP policy-making
 budget-making policy; decision-
 making in bureaucracy, par-
 ties and interest groups

GEORGE, B. JAMES, JR.
 Assoc. Director, Practicing
 Law Institute
 Adjunct Prof. of Law
 New York University
 J.D. 1951 Michigan

GINSBURG, NORTON S.
 Prof., Dept. of Geog.
 Assoc. Dean, Div. of Soc. Sci.
 University of Chicago
 Ph.D. 1949 Chicago, prewar Jap-
 anese trade and shipping in
 Far East
 Asian geog.

GLAZER, HERBERT
 Prof., Marketing and International Business
 School of Business Administration
 American University
 Ph.D. 1954 Boston University,
 molecular chemistry (nJ)
 international business in
 Japan

GOODMAN, GRANT K.
 Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 University of Kansas
 Ph.D. 1955 Michigan, Dutch
 impact during Tokugawa
 period
 Japanese pan-Asianism

GRIFFIN, EDWARD
 Office of External Research
 Dept. of State
 Ph.D. 1965 Columbia, ideological
 conflict in prewar
 proletarian parties
 parties, non-party forces and
 suffrage during Taisho
 period

HACKETT, ROGER F.
 Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 University of Michigan
 Ph.D. 1955 Harvard, Yamagata
 Aritomo
 role of military in modern
 development

HADLEY, ELEANOR
 Industrial Organization
 Economist
 U.S. Tariff Commission
 Washington, D.C.
 Ph.D. 1949 Radcliffe, concentrated
 business power
 antitrust

HAKEDA, YOSHITO S.
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of East
 Asian Lang.
 Columbia University
 Ph.D. Yale

HALL, JOHN W.
 Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Yale University
 Ph.D. 1950 Harvard, Tanuma
 Okitsugu
 Tokugawa institutional hist.

HALL, ROBERT B., JR.
 Prof., Dept. of Hist. and Geog.
 University of Rochester
 Ph.D.

HAMBRICK, CHARLES
 Inst., Dept. of Relig. Studies
 Vanderbilt University
 Ph.D. 1969 Chicago, Gukansho:
 religious view of Japanese
 hist.

HAN, MIEKO S.
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Asian
 Studies
 University of Southern California
 Ph.D. 1961 Texas, phonology
 Japanese lang. textbook

HANE, MIKISO
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Knox College
 Ph.D. 1957 Yale, Meiji intell.
 hist.
 hist. of Japan; translation
 of Hagakure

HARING, DOUGLAS G.
 Prof. Emeritus, Dept. of Anth.
 Syracuse University
 M.A. 1923 Columbia
 Ryukyu research library

HAROOTUNIAN, HARRY D.
 Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 University of Wisconsin
 Ph.D. 1957 Michigan, dissolution of samurai class
 intellectual hist. since 17th
 C.; Muromachi culture

HARPER, THOMAS J.
 Acting Inst., Dept. of East
 and South Asian Lang.
 Yale University
 Ph.D. cand. Michigan, "Genji
 Monogatari"

HARRISON, JOHN
 Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Dean, Graduate School
 University of Miami
 Ph.D. 1949 Berkeley, Hok-
 kaido: the northern fron-
 tier

HASHIMOTO, MANTARO J.
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of East
 Asian Studies
 Princeton University
 Ph.D. 1965 Ohio State, ling.
 (nJ)
 Sino-Japanese phonology; de-
 scriptive and comparative
 syntax

HAUSER, WILLIAM B.
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 University of Michigan
 Ph.D. 1969 Yale, econ. insti-
 tutional change, Tokugawa
 period
 econ. institutional change,
 Tokugawa; Hyōgo foreign
 trade

HAVENS, THOMAS R.
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Connecticut College
 Ph.D. 1965 Berkeley, Nishi
 Amane
 agrarian nationalist thought

HAZARD, BENJAMIN, JR.
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 San Jose State College
 Ph.D. 1967 Berkeley, Wakō im-
 pact on medieval Korea
 Korean response to wakō

HELLMAN, DONALD
 Assoc. Prof., Far Eastern and
 Russian Institute
 University of Washington
 Ph.D. 1964 Berkeley, postwar
 foreign policy and domestic
 politics
 effect of modernization and
 international system on na-
 tionalism; U.S.-Japan post-
 war alliance

HENDERSON, DAN F.
 Prof., School of Law
 Director, Asian Law Program
 University of Washington
 Ph.D. 1955 Berkeley, tradi-
 tional legal procedures

HIBBETT, HOWARD S.
 Prof., Dept. of FEL
 Harvard University
 Ph.D. 1950 Harvard, Ejima
 Kisshi
 leading modern novelists;
 Saikaku; late Tokugawa fic-
 tion

HIRABAYSHI, JAMES A.
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Anth.
 San Francisco State College
 Ph.D. 1962 Harvard, a mountain
 community
 social anth.

HIRAGA, NOBURU
 Lect., Far Eastern and Russian
 Institute
 University of Washington
 M.A. 1955 Denver, Tosa in the
 Meiji Restoration
 hist. of Japanese lang; hist.
 of Shima province

HOFFER, BATES L., III
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Asian
and Pacific Lang.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1967 Texas, linguistics
(nJ)
Japanese ling. textbook; syn-
tactic comparison, Japanese
and Okinawan

HOLLERMAN, LEON
Prof., Dept. of Econ.
Claremont Men's College
Ph.D. 1957 Berkeley, national
income and international
trade
econ. relations, Japan and
U.S. West coast

HOOVER, WILLIAM D.
Inst., Dept. of Hist.
University of Toledo
Ph.D. cand. Michigan, "Godai
Tomoatsu: A Japanese Mod-
ernizer"

HOUGH, RICHARD F.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Geog.
San Francisco State College
Ph.D. 1963 Wisconsin, seri-
culture,
geog., especially as related
to sericulture

HSU, FRANCIS L.
Prof., Dept. of Anth.
Northwestern University
Ph.D. 1940 London, anth. (nJ)
kinship and iemoto: compari-
son with China and U.S.;
kinship and culture

HUNSBERGER, WARREN
Prof., Dept. of Econ.
American University
Ph.D. 1937 Yale, internation-
al financial position of
Japan
Asian trade studies: Japan
and other Asian countries

HUNTSBERRY, WILLIAM RANDALL
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Relig.
Smith College
Ph.D. 1968 Harvard, relig.

HURST, GEORGE C.
Acting Asst. Prof., Dept. of
Hist.
University of Kansas
Ph.D. cand. Columbia, "Origins
and Development of the Insei"

HYER, PAUL
Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Brigham Young University
Ph.D. 1961 Berkeley, Japanese
relations with Tibet
occupation of inner Mongolia

IGA, MAMORU
Prof., Dept. of Soci.
San Fernando Valley State
College
Ph.D. 1955 Utah, acculturation
student suicides: value ori-
entations

IKE, NOBUTAKA
Prof., Dept. of Pol. Sci.
Stanford University
Ph.D. 1949 Johns Hopkins, dem-
ocratic movement in Meiji
period
decision-making re WWII in the
Pacific

IKEDA, HIROKO
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Asian
and Pacific Lang.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1956 Indiana, typology
of folk literature
Konjaku monogatari; typology
of folk tales

IKLE, FRANK W.
 Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 University of New Mexico
 Ph.D. 1953 Berkeley, German-
 Japanese relations
 diplomatic hist.

INAMOTO, NOBORU
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Asian
 Studies
 University of Southern Cali-
 fornia
 Ph.D.

IRIYE, AKIRA
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 University of Chicago
 Ph.D. 1961 Harvard, U.S. di-
 plomacy and Sino-Japanese
 relations
 Japanese expansion and U.S.-
 Asian relations

ISHINO, IWAQ
 Prof., Dept. of Anth.
 Michigan State University
 Ph.D. 1954 Harvard, ritual
 kinship: oyabun-kobun re-
 lationship
 Japan's participation in
 cultural ecumene

ITASAKA, GEN
 Lect., Dept. of FEL
 Harvard University

ITO, HIROSHI
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Pol.
 Sci.
 Illinois State University
 Ph.D. 1968 Washington (Seat-
 tle), Supreme Court deci-
 sion making
 Supreme Court cases

IWAMOTO, YOSHIO
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of FEL
 Indiana University
 Ph.D. 1964 Michigan, lit. and
 politics, 1931-1945
 politically oriented fiction
 since Meiji

IWATA, MASAKAZU
 Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Biola College
 Ph.D. 1960 U.C.L.A., Okubo
 Toshimichi
 Japan-U.S. research project,
 U.C.L.A.

JACKMAN, BARRY S.
 Inst., Asian Studies Program
 Carleton College
 Ph.D. cand., Columbia,
 "Harusame Monogatari of Ueda
 Akinari"

JACOBS, NORMAN
 Prof., Dept. of Soci.
 University of Illinois
 Ph.D. 1951 Harvard, comparative
 analysis of social institu-
 tions
 developmental and comparative
 soci.

JANSEN, MARIUS B.
 Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Chairman, Dept. of East Asian
 Studies
 Princeton University
 Ph.D. 1950 Harvard, Japan and
 the Chinese revolutionary
 movement
 20th C. Sino-Japanese rela-
 tions; Tosa local hist.

JO, YUNG-HWAN
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Pol Sci.
 Arizona State University
 Ph.D. 1964 American, Japanese
 geopolitics
 relations with East Asia

JOHNSON, ERWIN H.
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Anth.
 State University of New York,
 Buffalo
 Ph.D. 1961 Columbia, rural
 village structure
 ethnohistorical village
 analysis

JONES, STANLEIGH H., JR.
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Asian
 Studies
 Claremont Graduate School
 Ph.D. 1968 Columbia, Hiraga
 Gennai

JORDEN, ELEANOR H.
 Visiting Prof., Dept. of
 Ling.
 Cornell University
 Chairman, Dept. of East
 Asian Lang.
 Foreign Service Institute
 Dept. of State
 Ph.D. 1950 Yale, ling.
 language teaching materials

KAKIUCHI, HIROAKI GEORGE
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Geog.
 University of Washington
 Ph.D. 1958 Michigan, agricul-
 tural geog., Okayama plain
 agricultural geog.

KANG, MOON
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Econ.
 University of Missouri, Rolla
 Ph.D. 1960 Nebraska, monetary
 policy in econ. devel.
 international econ.; monetary
 theory

KARSH, BERNARD
 Prof., Dept. of Soci.
 University of Illinois
 Ph.D. 1955 Chicago, soci.
 (nJ)

technology and social change:
 emergence and devel. of in-
 dustrial relations systems

KATO, KAZUMITSU
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of FEL
 California State College, Los
 Angeles
 Ph.D. 1959 University of the
 Pacific, Dōgen
 life and teaching of Dōgen;
 Japanese religions

KEENE, DONALD
 Prof., Dept. of East Asian
 Lang.
 Columbia University
 Ph.D. 1951 Columbia, The Bat-
 tle of Coxinga
 translation of Nō; hist. of
 Japanese lit.

KERKHAM, CAROL E.
 Inst., Dept. of Modern Lang.
 Colby College
 Ph.D. cand. Indiana, Japanese
 lit.

KIKUOKA, TADASHI
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Asian
 Studies
 Seton Hall University
 Ph.D. 1961 Oregon, Sino-
 Japanese relations
 Chokoho Incident, 1938; test-
 ing of character compounds

KILEY, CORNELIUS J.
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of FEL
 University of Chicago
 Ph.D. cand. Harvard, medieval
 Japanese law

KIM, CHONGHAN
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Govt.
 College of William and Mary
 Ph.D. 1956 Indiana, Konoye
 Fumimaro and foreign policy

KIM, HEE-JIN
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Relig.
Wright State University
Ph.D. 1966 Claremont, Dōgen
Buddhist thought, religious
lang.

KIM, ILPYONG
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Pol,
Sci.
University of Indiana
Ph.D.

KIMIZUKA, SUMAKO
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Asian
Studies
University of Southern Cali-
fornia
Ed.D. 1962 U.C.L.A., problems
in lang. teaching

KITAGAWA, JOSEPH M.
Prof., Dept. of Hist. of
Relig.
University of Chicago
Ph.D. 1951 Chicago, Kobo
Daishi and Shingon Buddhism
mythology and Shinto ritual;
Heian Buddhism

KIYOSE, GISABURO N.
Dept. of East Asian Lang.
Indiana University

KOKORIS, JAMES A.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Econ.
Northeastern Illinois State
College
Ph.D. 1956 Michigan, econ.
devel., Okayama
econ. hist.

KOMAI, AKIRA
Assoc. Prof., Dept. East
Asian Lang.
University of Wisconsin
Ph.D. 1963 Michigan, phonolo-
gy of colloquial Japanese

KONNO, YUKIO
Inst., Dept. of Asian Lang.
University of Hawaii
M.A. 1962 Kokugakuin

KORNHAUSER, DAVID H.
Prof., Dept. of Geog.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1956 Michigan, influence
of geog. on rise of cities
factor analysis of 268 cities

KUBLIN, HYMAN
Prof., Dept. of Hist.
City University of New York,
Brooklyn
Ph.D. 1947 Harvard, Tokugawa
local hist.
organization of Ministry of
Foreign affairs, Meiji peri-
od; social thought of Kagawa
Toyohiko

KUBOTA, AKIRA
Res. Assoc., Center for Japa-
nese Studies
University of Michigan
Ph.D. 1966 Michigan, civil
servants in postwar period
polit. socialization; electoral
behavior

KUNISHIMA, MINAKO
Inst., Dept. of Asian Lang.
University of Hawaii
M.A. 1964 Michigan

KUNO, SUSUMU
Prof., Dept. of Ling.
Harvard University
Ph.D.

KURIHARA, KENNETH
Prof., Dept. of Econ.
State University of New York,
Binghamton
Ph.D. 1942 Iowa, econ. (nJ)
microeconomic theory: Japan

KURODA, SHIGEYUKI
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Ling.
University of California,
San Diego
Ph.D. 1965 M.I.T., generative
grammatical studies of Jap-
anese

KURODA, YASUMASA
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Pol.
Sci.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1962 Oregon, polit.
socialization of law stu-
dents
polit. socialization and re-
cruitment; public opinion;
community power

LAMBERTI, MATTHEW
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of California,
Santa Barbara
Ph.D. 1968 Columbia, Tokugawa
Nariaki
Tokugawa Nariaki and the im-
perial institution; village
control in Mito han

LANGE, ROLAND A.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of East
Asian Lang.
Columbia University
Ph.D. 1968 Michigan, 8th C.
phonology
dialects

LANHAM, BETTY B.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Be-
havioral Sciences
Union University, Albany
Medical College
Ph.D. 1962 Syracuse, child-
rearing
child-rearing; male-female
personality manifestations

LARGE, STEPHEN S.
Inst., Dept. of Hist.
University of Iowa
Ph.D. cand. Michigan, "The
Japanese Labor Movement:
Uzuki Bunji and the Yūaikai,
1912-1919"

LEBRA, JOYCE C.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of Colorado
Ph.D. 1958 Radcliffe, Okuma
Shigenobu
reading materials on Greater
East Asia Co-Prosperity
Sphere

LEBRA, WILLIAM P.
Director, Soc. Sci. Research
Institute
Prof., Dept. of Anth.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1958 Harvard, Okinawan
relig.
Okinawan shamanism

LEE, EDWIN B.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Hamilton College
Ph.D. 1960 Columbia, Ii Naosuke
Tanaka Chigaku and Nichiren
Buddhism

LEISERSON, MICHAEL
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Pol. Sci.
University of California,
Berkeley
Ph.D. 1966 Yale, pol. sci. (nJ)
contemporary politics

LENSEN, GEORGE
Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Florida State University
Ph.D. 1961 Columbia, Russian
hist.
Sino-Japanese relations

LEVINE, SOLOMON B.
 Prof., Dept. of Econ.
 Chairman, East Asian Studies
 Program
 University of Wisconsin
 Ph.D. 1951 M.I.T. econ. (nJ)
 contemp. industrial relations
 systems; industrial wage
 system; human resources in
 industrialization

LEVY, MARION J., JR.
 Prof., Dept. of Sociol.
 Princeton University
 Ph.D. 1947 Harvard, soci.
 (nJ)
 modernization

LEWIS, DAVID
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of
 Sociol.
 Western Michigan University
 Ph.D. 1963 Maryland, work-
 related values among rural
 youth
 self-disclosure patterns

LIDIN, OLAF G.
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Ori-
 ental Lang.
 University of California,
 Davis
 Ph.D. 1967 Berkeley, Ogyū
 Sorai
 critical translation of Ogyū
 Sorai

LIFTON, ROBERT
 Prof., Dept. of Psychiatry
 Yale Medical School
 M.D. 1948 New York Medical
 College

LIN, JUNG-SHUN
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Pol.
 Sci.
 State University College, New
 Paltz
 Ph.D. 1960 Pennsylvania, pop-
 ular movements during
 Taisho period

LOCKHEIMER, F. ROY
 Staff Associate for Japan
 American Universities Field
 Staff
 Ph.D. cand. Fletcher school,
 "Habatsu and the Liberal
 Democratic Party"

LOCKWOOD, WILLIAM W.
 Prof., Pol. and International
 Affairs
 Woodrow Wilson School
 Princeton University
 Ph.D. 1954 Harvard, econ.
 devel.
 politics of econ. devel.

LONG, THEODORE D.
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of I.R.
 Case Western Reserve University
 Ph.D. 1968 Columbia, postwar
 science policy

LOVELESS, OWEN
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of East
 Asian Lang.
 University of Minnesota
 Ph.D. 1963 Michigan, Okinawan
 lang.
 Okinawan, Japanese and Amharic

LU, DAVID
 Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Bucknell University
 Ph.D. 1960 Columbia, foreign
 policy 1937-40
 Matsuoka Yosuke; sources on
 Japanese hist.

MAKI, JOHN
 Prof., Dept. of Govt.
 University of Massachusetts,
 Amherst
 Ph.D. 1948 Harvard, militarism

MALM, WILLIAM P.
Prof., School of Music
University of Michigan
Ph.D. 1959 U.C.L.A., Nagauta
festival music; kabuki music;
left-wing music

MANCHESTER, CURTIS A.
Prof., Dept. of Geog.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1947 Michigan, sekisho
Pacific Ocean area geog.

MARETZKI, THOMAS
Prof., Dept. of Anth.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1957 Yale, child-
rearing in Okinawa
Okinawan anth.

MARKS, ALFRED H.
Prof., Dept. of Eng.
State University College,
New Paltz
Ph.D., American lit. (nJ)
Ai no Kawaki: translation

MARSH, ROBERT
Prof., Dept. of Soci.
Brown University
Ph.D. 1959 Columbia, Chinese
soci. (nJ)
social organization of fac-
tories and industrial pro-
ductivity

MARSHALL, BYRON K.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of Minnesota
Ph.D. 1966 Stanford, Ideology
and industrialization,
1868-1941
universities in social trans-
formation

MARTIN, HARRIS
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
San Jose State College
Ph.D. 1959 Stanford, Kita Ikki

MARTIN, SAMUEL E.
Prof., Dept. of East and South
Asian Lang.
Yale University
Ph.D. 1950 Yale, morphophonem-
ics of standard colloquial
Japanese
sentence structure

MARTINSON, FRED
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Art Hist.
University of Tennessee
Ph.D. 1968 Chicago, early
Muromachi screen painting
15th C. painting

MASSEY, JOSEPH A.
Inst., Dept. of Govt.
Dartmouth College
Ph.D. cand. Yale, "Culture
Cleavage in the Political
Socialization Process in
Japan"

MATHIAS, GERALD B.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of East
Asian Lang.
Indiana University
Ph.D. 1968 Berkeley, selection-
al features of verbs
formal semantic structure; re-
lationship between Japanese
and Korean

MATSUMOTO, AMY T.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Asian
Lang.
University of Hawaii

MATSUMOTO, Y. SCOTT
Assoc. Prof., School of Public
Health
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1955 American, collectiv-
ity orientation in contempo-
ary Japan
socio-cultural factors and ill-
ness; culture, society and
personality structure

MATSUNAGA, ALICIA O.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Oriental Lang.
University of California,
Los Angeles
Ph.D. 1964 Claremont, influence of Buddhist negation on the concept of divinity

MAXON, YALE
Prof., Dept. of Social Science
Oakland City College
Ph.D. 1952 Berkeley, foreign policy 1930-45

MAYER-OAKES, T. F.
Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Wayne State University
Ph.D.

MAYO, MARLENE J.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of Maryland
Ph.D. 1961 Columbia, Iwakura Mission
Iwakura mission; treaty revision

MCCALLUM, DONALD F.
Acting Asst. Prof., Dept. of Art
University of California,
Los Angeles
Ph.D. cand. NYU, "Stylistic Currents in Japanese Sculpture of the Tenth Century"

MCCAWLEY, JAMES D.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Ling.
University of Chicago
Ph.D. 1965 M.I.T., ling. structure of Japanese and English

McCLELLAN, EDWIN
Prof., Dept. of FEL
University of Chicago
Ph.D. 1957 Chicago, Natsume Soseki
Izumi Kyoka

McCOY, W. JOHN
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Ling.
Cornell University
Ph.D.

McCULLOUGH, HELEN
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Oriental Lang.
University of California,
Berkeley
Ph.D. 1955 Berkeley, Taiheiki
Heian society; translations of Eiga monogatari, Okagami

McCULLOUGH, WILLIAM
Prof., Dept. of Oriental Lang.
University of California,
Berkeley
Ph.D. 1962 Berkeley, Shokyu War study of Heian marriage institutions; translation of Eiga monogatari

McELRATH, MILES K., JR.
Lect., Dept. of FEL
University of Michigan
Ph.D. cand. Michigan, "A Study of the Seisuishō of Anrakuan Sakuden: Humorous Anecdotes of the Sengoku Period"

McKINNON, RICHARD N.
Prof., Far Eastern and Russian Institute
University of Washington
Ph.D. 1951 Harvard, Zeami on Nō

McKNIGHT, ROBERT
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Anth.
 California State College,
 Haywood
 Ph.D. 1960 Ohio State, anth.
 (nJ)
 translation of materials on
 Japanese in Micronesia

McNELLY, THEODORE H.
 Prof., Dept. of Govt. and
 Pol.
 University of Maryland
 Ph.D. 1952 Columbia, postwar
 constitutional revision
 Japanese soc. scientists'
 views of the polity; com-
 munist views of the Sino-
 Soviet split

McWILLIAM, WAYNE C.
 Inst., Dept. of Hist.
 Towson State College
 Ph.D. cand. Kansas, "The Po-
 litical Thought of Soejima
 Taneomi, Japanese Foreign
 Minister 1871-73"

MENDEL, DOUGLAS H., JR.
 Prof., Dept. of Pol. Sci.
 University of Wisconsin
 Ph.D. 1955 Michigan, postwar
 polit. behavior
 foreign policy in the '70's

MERRILL, JOHN E.
 Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 San Diego State College
 Ph.D. 1954 Stanford, American
 reactions to the annexation
 of Korea
 Japan's early 20th C. conti-
 nental policy

MIHAL, MILAN
 Inst., Dept. of Fine Arts
 Vanderbilt University
 Ph.D. 1969 Michigan, Sakai
 Hōitsu
 Sakai Hōitsu; annotated glos-
 sary of technical art termi-
 nology

MILLER, ALAN L.
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Relig.
 Stanford University
 Ph.D. 1968 Chicago, folk re-
 ligions
 Heian period popular religion

MILLER, FRANK O.
 Prof., Dept. of Pol. Sci.
 College of Wooster
 Ph.D. 1961 Berkeley, Minobe
 Tatsukichi
 development of judicial review;
 contemporary constitutional
 theory

MILLER, ROY ANDREW
 Prof., Dept. of East and South
 Asian Lang.
 Yale University
 Ph.D. 1953 Columbia

MINEAR, RICHARD H.
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Ohio State University
 Ph.D. 1968 Harvard, constitu-
 tional interpretation, Meiji
 period
 Japanese tradition and Western
 law; Tokyo War Crimes Trial

MINER, EARL ROY
 Prof., Dept. of Eng.
 University of California, Los
 Angeles
 Ph.D. 1955 Minnesota, Japanese
 influence on Brit. and Amer.
 lit.
 comparative lit. with emphasis
 on poetic tradition

MISHIMA, TOSHIKO
Lect., Dept. of Foreign Lang.
San Francisco State College
Ph.D. 1966 Georgetown, ling.
(nJ)

MITCHELL, RICHARD H.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of Rochester
Ph.D. 1963 Wisconsin, Korean
Minority in Japan, 1910-
1963
control of subversion, 1925-
35

MIURA, AKIRA
Inst., Japanese lang.
New School for Social Re-
search
Ed.D. cand. Teachers' Col-
lege, Columbia, "Tense and
Aspect in Japanese"

MIYAJI, HIROSHI
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Ori-
ental Studies
University of Pennsylvania
Ph.D. 1966 Stanford, frequen-
cy dictionary of Japanese
words and word classes

MIYAUCHI, DIXON Y.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
State University College,
Plattsburgh
Ph.D. 1957 Harvard, Yokoi
Shonan
19th C. Japanese ethnological
collections in the U.S. and
Europe

MOES, ROBERT
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Art
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. cand. Michigan, "The
'Eight Views of Hsiao-
Hsiang' in Muromachi and
Momoyama Painting"

MOORE, GEORGE E.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
San Jose State College
Ph.D. 1966 Berkeley, samurai
reaction to the West: Kozaki
Hiromichi
modernization

MOORE, RAY A.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Amherst College
Ph.D. 1968 Michigan, social
mobility of samurai in Tokugawa period
early modern social hist.

MOOS, FELIX
Prof., Dept. of Anth.
University of Kansas
Ph.D. 1963 Washington (Seat-
tle), social structure since
1945
rapid acculturation, East Asia

MORITA, JAMES
Asst. Prof., Dept. of FEL
University of Oregon
Ph.D. 1968 Chicago, Yamada
Bimyo
Meiji literary journals;
modern poetry

MORLEY, JAMES W.
Prof., Dept. of Govt.
Columbia University
Ph.D. 1954 Columbia, Siberian
expedition of 1918
policy making; translation of
Taiheiyo sensō e no michi

MORRELL, ROBERT E.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Chinese
and Japanese
Washington University (St.
Louis)
Ph.D. 1969 Stanford, annotated
translation of Shasekishū
Muju Ichien: religious syncre-
tism

MORRIS, IVAN
 Prof., Dept. of East Asian
 Lang.
 Columbia University
 Ph.D. 1951 London, Murasaki
 Shikibu
 general study of 17th C.

MORRIS, V. DIXON
 Acting Asst. Prof., Dept. of
 Hist.
 University of Hawaii
 Ph.D. cand. Michigan, "His-
 torical Study of Sakai"

MORTON, WILLIAM F.
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Boston University
 Ph.D. 1969 Columbia, Tanaka
 Cabinet and China policy
 Japanese response to Chinese
 nationalist revolution

MOTOFUJI, FRANK T.
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Ori-
 ental Lang.
 University of California,
 Berkeley
 Ph.D. 1964 Stanford, Naru-
kami: 17th C. kabuki play

MUNSTERBERG, HUGO
 Prof., Dept. of Art Hist.
 New York State University,
 New Paltz
 Ph.D. 1941 Harvard, art
 hist. (nJ)
 modern Japanese art

MURASE, MIEKO
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Art
 Hist.
 Columbia University
 Ph.D. 1962 Columbia, geneolo-
 gy of Tenjin engi scrolls
 illumination of Buddhist
 scriptures, Fujiwara period

NAFF, WILLIAM E.
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of FEL
 Director, Asian Studies Program
 University of Massachusetts,
 Amherst
 Ph.D. 1965 Washington (Seat-
 tle), Shimazaki Tōson
 lit. hist.; translation of
Heike Monogatari

NAGAI, WILLIE
 Inst., Dept. of Oriental Lang.
 University of Colorado
 Ph.D. cand. Colorado, hist.

NAGATOMI, MASATOSHI
 Prof., Dept. of Relig.
 Harvard University
 Ph.D.

NAJITA, TETSUO
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 University of Chicago
 Ph.D. 1964 Harvard, Seiyūkai
 radicalism in late Tokugawa
 period; late 18th C. thought

NAKAMURA, JAMES I.
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Econ.
 Columbia University
 Ph.D. 1964 Columbia, agricul-
 ture and econ. devel.
 prewar agricultural and econ.
 policies

NELSON, ANDREW N.
 Prof., Dept. of Educ.
 Loma Linda University
 Ph.D. 1938 Washington (Seat-
 tle), hist. of temples
 postwar hist. of temples; ad-
 ditions to and revisions of
 the dictionary

NEVILLE, EDWIN L.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Director, Institute of Asian
Studies
Canisius College
Ph.D. 1959 Michigan, devel.
of transportation, Bizen
han
devel. of transportation

NISHIHARA, SUZUKO O.
Lect., Dept. of FEL
University of Michigan
M.A. 1964 Michigan, Japanese
inflections

NISHIMURA, HIROKO
Inst., Dept. of Asian and
Pacific Lang.
University of Hawaii
M.A. 1962 Waseda

NIWA, TAMAKO
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Asian
Lang.
University of Washington
Ph.D. 1956 Harvard, Nakatsu-
kasa Naishi Nikki
lang. teaching techniques

NIYEKAWA-HOWARD, AGNES
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Educ.
Assoc. Researcher, Educ. Re-
search and Devel. Center
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1960 NYU, authoritari-
anism
psycho-linguistic study of
subjectless Japanese sen-
tences

NORBECK, EDWARD
Prof., Dept. of Anth. and
Soci.
Rice University
Ph.D. 1952 Michigan, a fish-
ing community
religious change

NOTEHELPER, FRED G.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of California, Los
Angeles
Ph.D. 1968 Princeton, Kōtoku
Shūsui
Kōtoku Shūsui

NUNN, G. R.
Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1957 Michigan, publish-
ing in modern period
development of the book in
Japan

O'BRIEN, JAMES
Asst. Prof., Dept. of East
Asian Lang.
University of Wisconsin
Ph.D. 1969 Indiana, Dazai
Osamu
Dazai Osamu

O'DELL, ROBERT M.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Central College
Ph.D. cand. Harvard, "Osugi
Sakae and the Japanese Anar-
chist Movement in the Taisho
Period"

ODO, FRANKLIN S.
Inst., Dept. of Hist.
Occidental College
Ph.D. cand. Princeton, "Saga
Han in the Tokugawa Period"

ODRONIC, WALTER J.
Asst. Prof., Center for Japa-
nese Studies
Bucknell University
Ph.D. 1967 Pennsylvania, anno-
tated translation of Kodo
tail
kokugakusha; Shinto; transla-
tions of Meiji lit.

OKAMOTO, SHUNPEI
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Temple University
Ph.D. 1969 Columbia, foreign
policy in the Russo-
Japanese war
Komura Jutarō; translation of
Mutsu Munemitsu's Kenken
roku

OLIVER, JOHN B.
Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Georgia State College
Ph.D. 1954 Duke, London
Naval Treaty of 1930
London Naval Treaty

OLSON, LAWRENCE
Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Wesleyan University
Ph.D. 1955 Harvard, Hara Kei
Marxism and the labor move-
ment; Japan in postwar Asia

OSHIMA, HARRY
Prof., Dept. of Econ.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1956 Columbia, national
income statistics, Asia
national income statistics,
Asia

OZAKI, ROBERT
Prof., Dept. of Econ.
California State College,
Hayward
Ph.D. 1960 Harvard, interna-
tional trade
foreign trade and investment
control, 1949-69

OZAWA, TERUTOMO
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Econ.
Colorado State University
Ph.D. 1966 Columbia, foreign
licensing operations
transmission of technology
and effects on econ. devel.

PACKARD, GEORGE R.
Managing Editor
The Evening and Sunday Bulle-
tin, Philadelphia
Ph.D. 1963 Fletcher, reaction
to U.S.-Japan alliance of
1960

PARK, YUNG-HO
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Pol. Sci.
Humboldt State College
Ph.D. 1968 Illinois, electoral
reform laws, 1962, and poli-
cy making

PASSIN, HERBERT
Prof., Dept. of Soci.
Columbia University
M.A. 1941 Chicago, kinship
national character; socio-
linguistic change; higher
education

PATRICK, HUGH T.
Prof., Dept. of Econ.
Yale University
Ph.D. 1960 Michigan, central
monetary control: Bank of
Japan
financial intermediation in
econ. growth; industrial
structure

PELZEL, JOHN C.
Prof., Dept. of Anth.
Director, Harvard-Yenching
Institute
Harvard University
Ph.D. 1949 Harvard, urban so-
cial stratification
rural social organizat., China

PFEIFER, DANIEL
Inst., Dept. of Foreign Lang.
Georgia State University
Ph.D. cand. Harvard, lang.

PIERSON, JOHN
Inst., Dept. of Hist.
University of Illinois
Ph.D. cand. Princeton, "The
Nineteenth Century Journal-
ist and Columnist Tokutomi
Sohō"

PITTS, FORREST R.
Prof., Dept. of Geog.
Assoc. Director, Social Sci-
ence Research Institute
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1955 Michigan, land
fertility inland sea area
postwar diffusion of hand
tractor

PLATH, DAVID W.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Anth.
University of Illinois
Ph.D. 1962 Harvard, holidays
in Japanese life
utopian groups and social
movements; social problems
of modernization

PLUMMER, JOHN F.
Prof., Dept. of Anth.
Lawrence College
Ph.D. 1963 Michigan, anth.
modernizing influences in
villages

POOR, ROBERT J.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Art
University of Minnesota
Ph.D.

PUGARELLI, NOBUKO
Inst., Dept. of Asian Lang.
University of Hawaii
M.A. 1967 Hawaii

PURCELL, DAVID C.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Miami University (Ohio)
Ph.D. 1967 Pennsylvania, ex-
pansion into the South
Pacific
administration of North Pacific
islands; prewar relations
with Southeast Asia and South
Pacific

PUTZAR, EDWARD D.
Lect., Dept. of Oriental
Studies
University of Arizona
M.A. 1960 Berkeley, medieval
lit.

PYLE, KENNETH B.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of Washington
Ph.D. 1965 Johns Hopkins,
search for national identi-
ty, 1887-95
rise of nationalism; relations
of social and econ. change
to international environment

QUACKENBUSH, EDWARD M.
Asst. Prof., Dept. Lang. and
Ling.
University of Rochester
Ph.D. Michigan, Japanese lit.

RAMSDELL, DANIEL B.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Bowling Green State University
Ph.D. 1961 Wisconsin, China
policy 1929-31
party government and China
policy; analysis of Diet,
prewar

REISCHAUER, EDWIN O.
Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Harvard University
Ph.D. 1939 Harvard, Ennin's
travels in China
current U.S.-Japan relations

RICHARDSON, BRADLEY
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Pol.
Sci.

Ohio State University
Ph.D. 1966 Berkeley, polit.
attitudes and voting be-
havior
contemporary polit. atti-
tudes; comparative polit.
culture, Germany-Japan

ROSEN, OSCAR
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Wisconsin State University
Ph.D. 1956 Wisconsin, hist.
(nJ)
German-Japan relations,
Russo-Japanese war and
Germany

ROSENFELD, JOHN M.
Prof., Dept. of Fine Arts
Harvard University
Ph.D. 1959 Harvard, Kushan
art
portraiture in Japan

ROSOVSKY, HENRY
Prof., Dept. of Econ.
Harvard University
Ph.D. 1959 Harvard, capital
formation
modern econ. growth

RUBIN, JAY
Asst. Prof., Dept. of FEL
Harvard University
Ph.D. 1969 Chicago, Kunikida
Doppo

RICH, BARBARA
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Ori-
ental Studies
Director, Institute for Medi-
eval Japanese Studies
University of Pennsylvania
Ph.D. 1965 Columbia, Otogi
Bunko and the Muromachi
short story
medieval intellectual hist.,
lit. and performing arts

RYAN, MARLEIGH
Asst. Prof., Dept. of East
Asian Lang.
Columbia University
Ph.D. 1965 Columbia, Futabatei
Shimei's Ukigumo
early modern lit. criticism;
hist. of lit.

SAKAI, ROBERT
Prof., Dept. of Hist.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1953 Harvard, educ. (nJ)
annotated translation of biog-
raphy of Zusho Shozaemon;
Shimazu Nariakira and Saigo
Takamori

SAKAMAKI, SHUNZO
Prof., Dept. of Hist.
President, University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1948 Columbia, contacts
with and conceptions of
America, 1790-1853
Ryukyu-Satsuma relations

SAKAMOTO, HIROSHI
Lect., Dept. of Asian Lang.
Stanford University
M.A. 1968 Tokyo Metropolitan
University, morphology of
Sino-Japanese words
teaching methods

SANCHES, MARY
Res. assoc.
University of Texas
Ph.D. 1968 Stanford, lang.
lang. usage and devel.

SATO, MASAHIITO
Inst., Dept. of Asian Lang.
University of Hawaii
M.A. 1966 Indiana

SATO, TOSHIHIKO
 Prof., Dept. of Oriental Lit.
 Virginia State College
 Ph.D. 1966 Washington (Seat-
 tle), Ibsen in Japan
 hist. of theater; Ibsen in
 modern Japanese lit.

SAUNDERS, E. DALE
 Prof., Dept. of Oriental
 Studies
 University of Pennsylvania
 Ph.D. 1953 Paris
 relig.; Buddhism and lit.

SAXONHOUSE, GARY
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Econ.
 University of Michigan
 Ph.D. cand. Yale, "Basic
 Determinants of Improve-
 ments in the Efficiency of
 Production in the Japanese
 Cotton Textile Industry
 1888-1940"

SCALAPINO, ROBERT
 Prof., Dept. of Pol. Sci.
 University of California,
 Berkeley
 Ph.D. 1948 Harvard, polit.
 party failure
 comparative polit. elites,
 Communist Asia

SCHEINER, IRWIN
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 University of California,
 Berkeley
 Ph.D. 1966 Michigan, modern
 social criticism: samurai
 and Christian values
 dissent and rebellion in
 Meiji period

SCULL, PENELOPE
 Lect., Dept. of Art Hist.
 New York University
 Ph.D. cand. NYU, battle
 painting genre

SEIDENSTICKER, EDWARD
 Prof., Dept. of FEL
 University of Michigan
 M.A. 1947 Columbia
 Heian and modern lit.

SELDEN, KYOKO
 Inst., Dept. of Oriental Lang.
 Washington University (St.
 Louis)
 Ph.D. 1965 Yale, English lit.
 (nJ)

SEAR, CARL
 Inst., Dept. of Asian Lang.
 Wesleyan University
 Ph.D. cand. Columbia, Chinese
 influences on Nō

SHIMADA, SHUJIRO
 Prof., Dept. of Art and Archae-
 ology
 Princeton University
 M.A. Kyoto University

SHINODA, MINORU
 Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Director, Institute of Advanced
 Projects
 University of Hawaii
 Ph.D. 1957 Columbia, founding
 of the Kamakura shogunate
 intellectual hist.

SHIRATO, ICHIRO
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of East
 Asian Lang.
 Columbia University

SHIVELY, DONALD
 Prof., Dept. of FEL
 Harvard University
 Ph.D. 1951 Harvard, The Love
 Suicide at Amijima by
 Chikamatsu
Buke shohatto; administration
 of Osaka during Tokugawa
 period

SHOHARA, HIDE
 Prof. Emeritus
 University of Michigan
 Visiting Prof., Dept. of East
 and South Asian Lang.
 University of Minnesota
 Ph.D. 1932 Michigan
gairaigo; lang. teaching

SHULMAN, FRANK J.
 Res. assoc.
 Center for Japanese Studies
 University of Michigan
 M.A. Michigan
 international directory to
 dissertations on Japan and
 Korea

SIBLEY, WILLIAM F.
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of FEL
 University of Michigan
 Ph.D. cand. Chicago, "A Read-
 ing of Four Modern Real-
 ists: Shūsei, Hakuchō,
 Arishima and Shiga"

SILBERMAN, BERNARD S.
 Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Duke University
 Ph.D. 1956 Michigan, demo-
 cratic movement in 1915-21
 bureaucracy in polit. devel.
 prewar polit. party devel.

SINGLETON, JOHN
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Educ.
 Chairman, International and
 Development Educ., School
 of Educ.
 University of Pittsburgh
 Ph.D. 1965 Stanford, educ. as
 instrument of national
 policy
 comparative urban educ. prob-
 lems, U.S.-Japan

SKELTON, T. LANE
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Soci.
 California State College,
 Humboldt
 Ph.D. 1968 Berkeley, Sōka
 gakkai

SMETHURST, RICHARD
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 University of Pittsburgh
 Ph.D. 1968 Michigan, militarism
 social basis for militarism

SMITH, ALLEN H.
 Prof., Dept. of Anth.
 Washington State University
 Ph.D. 1941 Yale, anth. (nJ)
 culture of a Ryukyu village

SMITH, HENRY DeW., III
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Princeton University
 Ph.D. cand. Harvard, "Student
 Radicals in Prewar Japan"

SMITH, ROBERT J.
 Prof., Dept. of Anth.
 Cornell University
 Ph.D. 1953 Cornell, an agri-
 cultural community
 ancestor worship; Tokugawa
 urban demography; immigrants
 in Brazil

SMITH, THOMAS C.
 Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Stanford University
 Ph.D. 1948 Harvard, government
 enterprise 1850-80
 premodern econ. growth; impact
 thereof on social structure
 and polit. orientation

SOGA, MATSUO
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Ling.
 University of Iowa
 Ph.D. 1966 Indiana, syntactic
 rules of colloquial Japanese
 derivational morphology

SONG, ZINO

Res. specialist, Dept. of
Asian and Pacific Lang.
University of Hawaii
M.A. 1968 Hawaii
advanced level lang. texts

SOFER, ALEXANDER

Prof., Dept. of Fine Arts
New York University
Ph.D. 1942 Princeton, Bud-
dhist architecture

SOUKUP, JAMES

Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Govt.
University of Texas
Ph.D. 1957 Michigan, polit.
attitudes in labor organi-
zations
foreign policy in Southeast
Asia; interest groups:
labor unions

SOVIAK, EUGENE

Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Washington University (St.
Louis)
Ph.D. 1962 Michigan, early
Meiji intellectual hist.
Meiji intellectual hist.

SPAULDING, ROBERT M., JR.

Res. assoc., Center for Japa-
nese Studies
Lect., Dept. of Hist.
University of Michigan
Ph.D. 1965 Michigan, civil
service examinations, pre-
war
prewar higher civil service;
origins of Cabinet-Privy
Council conflicts

SPEAR, RICHARD L.

Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Ori-
ental Lang.
University of Kansas
Ph.D. 1966 Michigan, grammat-
ical study of medieval col-
loquial text
syllabus on lit.

STANIFORD, PHILIP S.

Asst. Prof., Dept. of Anth.
California State College, San
Diego
Ph.D. 1967 London School of
Economics, anth. (nJ)
emigration; small group inter-
action

STEINER, KURT

Prof., Dept. of Pol. Sci.
Stanford University
Ph.D. 1955 Stanford, local
government
urban politics; modernization
and trends in divorce rates

STEINHOFF, PATRICIA GOLDEN

Asst. Prof., Dept. of Soci.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1969 Harvard, "Tenkō:
Ideology and Societal Inte-
gration in Prewar Japan"

STEMEN, JOHN R.

Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Gettysburg College
Ph.D. 1960 Indiana, immigra-
tion issue
modern hist.

STERN, HAROLD P.

Asst. Director
Freer Gallery of Art
Smithsonian Institution
Ph.D. 1959 Michigan, Ukiyoe
painting
Ukiyoe and Yamatoe schools

STESLICK, WILLIAM

Visiting Assoc. Prof., Dept.
of Pol. Sci.
Columbis University
Ph.D. 1965 Michigan, politics
of medical care
welfare state; polit. leader-
ship

STEVENS, CHARLES R.
Visiting Lect., School of Law
Columbia University
Associate,
Coudert Brothers
LL.B. 1966 Harvard Law School
Japanese export cartels and
American anti-trust laws

SUGITA, HIROSHI
Inst., Dept. of Asian and
Pacific Lang.
University of Hawaii
M.A. 1966 International
Christian University

SUSSER, BERNARD
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Northern Illinois University
Ph.D. cand. Yale, "Hideyo-
shi's Cadastral Survey"

SUZUKI, YUKIHISA
Prof., Dept. of Library
Studies
Asia Library
University of Michigan
Ph.D. cand. Michigan, "Ameri-
can Influence on the Devel-
opment of Library Sciences
in Japan"

SWIFT, THOMAS D.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
California State College,
Sacramento
Ph.D. cand. Berkeley, "Yama-
kawa Hitoshi and the Dawn
of Japanese Socialism"

SWINDELL, KIMIE
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Foreign
Lang.
California State College, San
Jose
Ph.D. 1968 Stanford, diction-
ary of syllables

TAHARA, MILDRED
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Asian
Lang.
University of Hawaii
M.A. 1965 Hawaii

TAIRA, KOJI
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Econ.
Stanford University
Ph.D. 1961 Stanford, wage
differentials
labor market and labor move-
ment; urbanization and
poverty

TAKAGAKI, TETSUO
Inst., Dept. of Asian Lang.
University of Hawaii
M.A. 1966 San Francisco State
College

TAKAHARA, KUMIKO
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Oriental
Lang.
University of Colorado
Ph.D. cand. London, "A Genera-
tive Grammar of Japanese"

TAKAHASHI, GEORGE
Lect., Dept. of Oriental Lang.
University of California, Los
Angeles
M.A. 1961 UCLA
neoclassification of verbs

TAKAHASHI, YOSHI
Inst., Dept. of Asian Lang.
University of Hawaii
M.A. 1952 San Francisco Theo-
logical Seminary

TAKAYA, TED T.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Asian
Lit.
University of Washington
Ph.D. 1969 Columbia, Japanese
lit.

TAKUCHI, KEIKO
Inst., Dept. of Asian Lang.
University of Hawaii
M.A. 1965 San Francisco
State College

TAKIZAWA, MAKOTO
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Pol.
Sci.
Texas Christian University
Ph.D. 1967 Florida State, re-
armament and the search for
peace and prosperity

TEELE, ROY E.
Prof., Dept. of Ling.
University of Texas
Ph.D. 1949 Columbia, lit.
(nJ)
Nō; Manyōshu

TEETER, KARL V.
Prof., Dept. of Ling.
Harvard University
Ph.D. 1962 California, ling.
(nJ)
hist. and dialects of Japa-
nese lang.

TERASAKI, ETSUKO
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Ling.
Cornell University
Ph.D. 1969 Columbia, Genzai
plays in Nō genre

TETERS, BARBARA
Prof., Dept. of Pol. Sci.
Iowa State University
Ph.D. 1955 Washington (Seat-
tle), conservative opposi-
tion in politics

THAYER, NATHANIEL
Director of Programs
Japan Society, New York
Ph.D. 1967 Columbia, conser-
vative rule in Japan
security treaty

THURSTON, DONALD
Inst., Dept. of Pol. Sci.
Union University
Ph.D. cand. Columbia, "The
Japan Teacher's Union as a
Pressure Group"

TIEDEMANN, ARTHUR
Prof., Dept. of Hist.
City College of New York
Ph.D. 1959 Columbia, Hamaguchi
Cabinet
era of the Hamaguchi Cabinet;
foreign econ. policy during
modern period

TIERNEY, EMIKO O.
Inst., Dept. of Soci. and
Anth.
Marquette University
Ph.D. 1968 Wisconsin, Sakhalin
Ainu world view
linguistic anth., world views

TITUS, DAVID A.
Lect., Dept. of Govt.
Wesleyan University
Ph.D. 1970 Columbia, prewar
politics
imperial household bureaucracy

TOTMAN, CONRAD
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Northwestern University
Ph.D. 1964 Harvard, Tokugawa
bakufu
fall of the bakufu; development
of Edo: case study in urban
devel.

TOTTEN, GEORGE O.
Prof., Dept. of Pol. Sci.
University of Southern Cali-
fornia
Ph.D. 1954 Yale, prewar social
democratic movement
developing nations; Japanese
foreign policy; Buddhism and
prewar social protest

TSU, JOHN B.
Prof., Dept. of Asian Studies
Seton Hall University
Ph.D. 1953 Fordham
hist. and govt.

TSUBAKI, ANDREW T.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Speech
and Drama
University of Kansas
Ph.D. 1967 Illinois, Zeami on
yūgen

TSUKAMOTO, JACK T.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Ori-
ental Lang.
Washington University (St.
Louis)
Ph.D. cand., Texas, "Wa and
Ga construction in Japa-
nese"

TUSKIMURA, REIKO
Asst. Prof., Dept. of East
Asian Lang.
University of Minnesota
Ph.D. 1967 Indiana, symbolism
in Yeats and Hagiwara
Nō; Kawabata's novels

TSUNEISHI, WARREN
Chief, Orientalia Division
Library of Congress
Ph.D. 1960 Yale, constitu-
tional and political change

TUSSING, ARLON R.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Econ.
University of Alaska
Ph.D. 1966 Washington (Seat-
tle), Meiji econ.

UEHARA, TOYOAKI
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of East.
Asian Lang.
Indiana University
Ph.D. 1960 Southern Califor-
nia, archetypes in Shinto
myths and rituals

UYEHARA, YUKUO
Prof., Dept. of Asian Lang.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D.
poetry, contemp. lit.

VANDERSTAPPEN, HARRIE
Prof., Dept. of Art
University of Chicago
Ph.D. 1955 Chicago
art hist., China and Japan

VARLEY, HERBERT P.
Assoc. Prof., Dept. of East
Asian Lang.
Columbia University
Ph.D. 1964 Columbia, Onin war
samurai; medieval hist.

VIGLIELMO, VALDO H.
Prof., Dept. of Asian Lang.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1956 Harvard, Natsume
Sōseki
modern lit.; intellectual in-
terchange with Europe, 17th
and 18th C.'s

VOGEL, EZRA
Prof., Dept. of Soci.
Harvard University
Ph.D. 1958 Harvard, family
relationships
soc. relations

WAGATSUMA, HIROSHI
Prof., Dept. of Soci.
University of Pittsburgh
Ph.D. 1968 Tokyo, social psy-
chology
lower-class families in Tokyo;
bibliography on Sōka gakkai

WARD, ROBERT E.
 Prof., Dept. of Pol. Sci.
 University of Michigan
 Ph.D. 1948 Berkeley, party
 government, 1928-1937
 democracy and planned polit.
 change; annotated bibliog-
 raphy on Allied Occupation;
 age and politics

WARGO, ROBERT J.
 Acting Asst. Prof., Dept. of
 Phil.
 University of Michigan
 Ph.D. cand. Michigan, modern
 phil.

WASWO, ANN
 Acting Asst. Prof., Dept. of
 Hist.
 Stanford University
 Ph.D. 1969 Stanford, land-
 lords and social change,
 prewar
 landlord-tenant relations,
 1920-1940; translation of
 materials on pre-Heian
 society

WEBB, HERSCHEL
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Columbia University
 Ph.D. 1958 Columbia, early
 Mito school
 Imperial institution

WEINSTEIN, MARTIN
 Res. Assoc., Asst. Director
 East Asian Institute
 Columbia University
 Ph.D. 1969 Columbia, postwar
 defense policy
 foreign policy and arms limi-
 tation agreements

WEINSTEIN, STANLEY
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Reli-
 gious Studies
 Yale University
 Ph.D. 1966 Harvard, annotated
 translation of Kanjin kaku-
mushō
 hist. of Buddhist thought

WEITZMAN, RAYMOND S.
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Ling.
 Fresno State College
 Ph.D. 1969 Southern California,
 accent, based on acoustic-
 phonetic data
 acoustic-phonetic study of
 Asian lang.

WHITE, JAMES W.
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Pol. Sci.
 University of North Carolina
 Ph.D. 1969 Stanford, Sōka
 gakkai in politics

WILKINSON, THOMAS O.
 Prof., Dept. of Soci.
 University of Massachusetts,
 Amherst
 Ph.D. 1957 Columbia, demo-
 graphic study of Tokyo
 population

WILLIS, D. S.
 Prof., Dept. of Oriental Lang.
 and Lit.
 University of Colorado
 Ph.D. 1951 Washington (Seat-
 tle), lit. (nJ)
 Japanese lang. reader

WILSON, GEORGE
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 Indiana University
 Ph.D. 1965 Harvard, Kita Ikki
 historiography of the Meiji
 Rest.; Hashimoto Sanai

WILSON, ROBERT A.
 Assoc. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
 University of California, Los
 Angeles
 Ph.D. 1949 Washington (Seat-
 tle), political institu-
 tions and leading figures
 of Meiji govt.
 late Tokugawa, early Meiji
 pol. hist.

WILSON, WILLIAM R.
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Asian
 Studies
 University of Southern Cali-
 fornia
 Ph.D. 1967 Washington (Seat-
 tle), Wōgen monogatari
 late classical tanka; trans-
 lation of vol. XXV of
Konjaku monogatari

WIMBERLY, H. HOWARD
 Asst. Prof., Dept. of Soci.
 and Anth.
 University of Iowa
 Ph.D. 1967 Cornell, Seichō
no Ie
 anth. comparison of Japan and
 Mexico

WINTERSTEEN, PRESCOTT
 Inst., Dept. of Hist.
 Skidmore College
 Ph.D. cand. Yale, "Bakufu
 Finance and Shogunal Power
 under Ashikaga Yoshimitsu"

WRIGHT, HAROLD P.
 Inst., Dept. of East Asian
 Lang.
 Ohio State University
 Ph.D. cand. Columbia, "Modern
 Japanese Poets"

YAMADA, YUKIHIRO
 Inst., Dept. of Asian and
 Pacific Lang.
 University of Hawaii
 M.A. 1962 International
 Christian University

YAMAGUCHI, EITETSU
 Lect., Dept. of FEL
 Yale University
 M.A. 1965 Indiana
 Ryukyuan lang.

YAMAMURA, KOZO
 Prof., Dept. of Econ.
 Boston College
 Ph.D. 1964 Northwestern, com-
 petition and monopoly, post-
 war
 econ. hist.

YAMPOLSKY, PHILIP
 Adjunct Assoc. Prof., Dept. of
 East Asian Lang.
 Chief, East Asian Library
 Columbia University
 Ph.D. 1965 Columbia, Buddhist
 studies
 translation of selected works
 of Hakuin

YANAGA, CHITOSHI
 Prof., Dept. of Pol. Sci.
 Yale University
 Ph.D. 1934 Berkeley, state
 theory
 bureaucracy; Japan's emergence
 as world power

YANAGIHASHI, MINORU
 Lect., Pol. Sci.
 University of Michigan
 Ph.D. cand. Michigan, "Elec-
 toral Politics in Contempo-
 rary Japan:..."

YOSHIHARA, KUNIO
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Econ.
University of Michigan
Ph.D. 1966 Berkeley, econo-
metric study of econ.
devel.

YOSHIHASHI, TAKEHIKO
Prof., Dept. of I.R.
American University
Ph.D. 1958 Yale, Manchurian
crisis and rise of the
military
polit. implication of
civilian-milit. relations

YOSHIKAWA, MUNEO
Inst., Dept. of Asian and
Pacific Lang.
University of Hawaii
M.A. 1967 Hawaii, lang.
teaching
integrated lang. learning,
lang. teacher training

YOST, JOSIE L.
Inst., Dept. of Applied Arts
Syracuse University
Ph.D. cand. Syracuse, "Direc-
tion of Change and Cultural
Continuity of Spatial Rela-
tionships with the Result-
ant Effect on Japanese
Culture"

YOTSUKURA, SAYO
Asst. Prof., School of Lang.
and Lit.
Georgetown University
Ph.D. 1963 Michigan, ling.
(nJ)
Japanese syntax

YOUNG, DANA
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Asian
Lang.
Stanford University
Ph.D. cand. Harvard, "A
Stylistic Analysis of
Utsubo Monogatari"

YOUNG, JOHN
Prof., Dept. of Asian Lang.
University of Hawaii
Ph.D. 1955 Johns Hopkins,
location of Yamatai
speech level

YOUNG, KATSU H.
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
San Fernando Valley State
College
Ph.D. 1968 Washington (Seat-
tle), milit. hist. 1936-1941
milit. in China, 20th C.

HALL, IVAN
Asst. Prof., Dept. of Hist.
Stanford University
Ph.D. 1969 Harvard, Mori
Arinori

HANLEY, SUSAN B.
Visiting Asst. Prof., Dept. of
Hist.
University of Washington
Ph.D. cand. Yale, "Population
Trends in Tokugawa Japan"